DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 284	EC 114 408
AUTHOR	Nesbitt, John A., Comp.
TITLE	National Institute on New Models of Community Based Recreation and Leisure Programs and Services for Handicapped Children and Youth. Final Report. Institute Report #10.
INSTITUTION	Iowa Univ., Iowa City. Recreation Education Program.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	78
GRANT	G007501219
NOTE	157p.; For related information, see ED 132 793-803; ED 143 176; ED 154 593; EC 114 401-409; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Programs; Handicapped; *Handicapped Children; *Leisure Time; *Program Evaluation; *Recreation

ABSTRACT

The final report of the project on community-based recreation for the handicapped details training activities, materials and evaluation findings. A chart lists approximately 40 primary training activities with information on date and location, faculty resource person, number attending, number of requests, and number of evaluations. The primary materials produced by the project are summarized and distribution procedures reviewed. The evaluation section includes mean ratings for 13 criteria at 26 institutes, and general comments from participants. Five conclusions and recommendations are presented, including the existence of such new models for recreation services as consumer, advocate, commercial, and creative and performing arts models. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED168284

Final Report of the

National Institute on New Models of Community Based Recreation and Leisure Programs and Services for Handicapped Children and Youth

A Project Conducted by

Dr. John A. Nesbitt, Professor and Project Director
Recreation Education Program
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242 (Tel. 319/353-6808; 319/353-4989)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Sponsored by the

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
Office of Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Washington, D.C. 20202

Project Term: 1975-76, 1976-77, 1977-78

Federal Employer Identification Number: 142 6004 813 A 1

Federal Identification Continuation Number: G00: 7-501219; FY 77 PR # 451:
BH 70067

Certifying Representative: Dean D.C. Spriestersbach, Vice-President for Educational Development and Research and Dean of the Graduate College, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242

BEH Project Officer: Mr. William A. Hillman, Jr.

EC114408

Distribution: 10 copies to BEH; 5 copies to UI Sponsored Programs

Copy for ___ BEH
#15 UI SP

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John A. Nesbitt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Institute Report # 10

National Institute on Community Recreation for the Handicapped -
A Project Funded by the U.S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Report of the National Institute on New Models of Community Based Recreation and Leisure Programs and Services for Handicapped Children and Youth

Compiled by

John A. Nesbitt

Editorial Assistant, Geri M. Bjork

Reports and Papers by

Carla Caudill, Steve Leclair and Mary Palmberg

Recreation Education Program
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

1978

Acknowledgements

The National Institute on New Models of Community-Based Recreation and Leisure Programs and Services for Handicapped Children and Youth has been a far ranging and diverse activity. It has involved over 100 faculty and advisers, some 40 training activities serving nearly all the states, the dissemination of 25,000 training aids and over 3,000 participants in training activities.

The quality and quantity of activity that has been involved bears witness to the intense concern and commitment of professionals, consumers and advocates who gave their individual and collective support to this undertaking. It is obvious that the National Institute could not have happened without the voluntary contributions of people who were involved in various ways and at various times.

In reviewing the training and service that has been rendered it is clear that everyone who has participated deserves thanks and I wish to express my thanks. It has been a personal and professional privilege for me to be able to be part of such an exciting and challenging activity.

I wish to express appreciation to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped and the many staff who assisted with the National Institute Project, in particular, Dr. Ed Martin, Mr. William A. Hillman, Jr. and Mr. Tom Behrens.

John A. Nesbitt

Institute Report # 10

National Institute on Community Recreation for the Handicapped
A Project Funded by the U.S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Report of the National Institute on New Models of Community Based Recreation and Leisure Programs and Services for Handicapped Children and Youth

Compiled by

John A. Nesbitt, Professor and Project Director
National Institute on Community Recreation for the Handicapped
Recreation Education Program
University of Iowa

Editorial Assistant, Geri M. Bjork

Reports and Papers by

Ms. Carla Caudill, Project Assistant
Steve Leclair, Research Assistant
Mary Palmberg, Project Assistant
National Institute on Community Recreation for the Handicapped

Recreation Education Program
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Introduction 1

II. Training Activities 3

III. Training Materials 29

IV. Training Evaluation 39

V. Conclusions and Recommendations 123

I. Introduction

The idea of community or special recreation for people who are handicapped is gaining a larger constituency every year. Just a few years ago the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in preparing the Nationwide Outdoor Recreation Plan reduced attention to responding to the needs of the nation's 25 million and more handicapped to a minimal level. Currently, the Heritage, Conservation and Recreation Service is undertaking the task of preparing a new nationwide recreation plan. At the National Forum conducted by HCRS "meeting the recreation needs of the handicapped" was one of 10 major areas addressed by planners. This is but one example of the progress that is being made in special recreation.

There are many aspects of special recreation where significant activity at the local level can be cited. There are up to 750,000 people involved annually in the Special Olympics and related activities. There are now 60,000 youth who are handicapped who are involved in the Boy Scouts of America program. There are 15,000 physically handicapped who participate annually in wheelchair sports. Over the last 20 years there have been 400 local departments of parks and recreation that have provided recreation programs for special populations. At the present time there are approximately 900 local park and recreation department workers whose primary function is service to people who are handicapped.

At the Federal level, the U.S. Rehabilitation Services Administration which has had an interest in recreation for the ill and handicapped for some 20 years has expanded support from assistance for training and research to support for training, research, facility development and demonstration and service. The U.S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the last 10 years has expanded support for training, research and special projects in physical education and recreation for handicapped from $600,000 per year to over $3,000,000 per year. The U.S. President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped which has supported recreation and the arts for handicapped for nearly 30 years, has for the last five years supported a special Committee on Recreation and Leisure which has provided national leadership and information service for program development. Without question, special recreation is gaining support at the national level.

The project, National Institute on Community-Based Recreation and Leisure Programs and Services for Handicapped Children and Youth, funded by the U.S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped and conducted through the University of Iowa, came at a critical time in terms of the need for training, for ascertaining the state of the art and for identifying models, both new and standard, of delivery of service.

A number of basic training aids were developed for use in the nationwide program of training that was provided. These basic training materials and the training activities that were conducted are enumerated in the report that follows. It should be noted that no attempt is made in this report of activity to recapitulate the primary documentation emanating from the project which totals nearly 2,000 pages nor the support materials that were produced during the course of the project. The original papers, guides, reports and other materials used in the National Institute Project number in the hundreds. Interested readers are referred to National Institute Reports Number 1 through 9.

II. Training Activities

During the course of the National Institute project some 40 primary training activities were provided as follows:

A. Training activities organized by the National Institute

B. Training activities organized and provided through the cooperation of organizations such as the U.S. President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Southern University, etc.

C. Training activities organized and provided through national and state organizations including the National Recreation and Park Association and its branches and regional councils; the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation and its brances and district alliances; state organizations such as the Colorado Park and Recreation Association and its therapeutic branch section, etc.; and through the cooperation and assistance of organization at the national, state and local levels such as the American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities, the U.S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, the National Consortium on Physical Education and Recreation for Handicapped, etc.

D. Training activities provided on an individual or small group basis in relation to the objectives of the National Institute Project.

E. Dissemination of expert opinion on the state of the art, goals, unmet needs in delivery of service in terms of service, training and education, research and demonstration, program development, etc., through special papers and materials provided to the U.S. President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on the Handicapped, the U.S. Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, the U.S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, etc.

These training activities ranged from three day conferences devoted exclusively to new models of community recreation for handicapped, to one day institutes, to mini-institutes within workshops or conferences, to single session training programs at conferences, etc.

Participation during the course of the National Institute Project can be summarized as follows.

Total number of participants	3,339
Total number of participants registered and requesting follow up materials	2,401 (1)
Total number of participants completing evaluations	1,089 (2)

The tables that follow provide information on the primary training activities that were provided. However, while complete records on requests, telephone consultation, correspondence, referrals and other project training activities have been maintained for the purpose of making this information available to national and state organizations and succeeding developmental activities and projects in community recreation for handicapped, this information is too diverse to serve any purpose in the present report and is not dealt with herein.

---

(1) Basic training aids were distributed at the start of all conferences. This figure reflects follow up requests and materials specifically requested prior to training activities.

(2) Of the figure 1,089, 742 evaluations were collected and analyzed by the National Institute and 347 were collected and analyzed by the host or cooperating organization.

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Eval-ations
Conference National Conference on New Models of Community-Based Recreation and Leisure Programs and Servites for Handicapped Children and Youth Sessions See Program of National Conference Sponsor National Institute on New Models of Community-Based Recreation and Leisure Programs and Services for Handicapped Children and Youth	July 7-9, 1976 Iowa City, Iowa	Trainers John A. Nesbitt and Faculty of National Institute (See Program of National Conference) Coordinators Ralph Rieks Richard MacNeil Randy Vessell Ellen Mihalovich	65	65	14
Seminar National Seminar on Consumer Leisure Competencies Conducted by the National Institute in Cooperation with the Committee on Recreation and Leisure of the U.S. President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Session Workshop Sponsors National Institute and Committee on Recreation and Leisure of the U.S. President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped	Sept. 9, 1976 Washington, D.C.	Trainers John A. Nesbitt Paul Hippolitus Panelists Jerry Fain Jerry Kelley David Compton	12	12	0

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Eval-ations
Workshop Municipal In-Service Training Workshop on New Models of Community Based Recreation for Handicapped Session New Models of Community Recreation for the Handicapped Sponsor Colorado Therapeutic Recreation Society and Fort Logan Mental Health Center	Sept. 20, 1976 Fort Logan Mental Health Center Denver, Colorado	Trainer John A. Nesbitt Coordinator John Cogley	75	66	14
Consultation Municipal Consultation on New Models of Community Based Recreation for the Handicapped	Sept. 21, 1976 Colorado Springs, Colorado	Trainer John A. Nesbitt Coordinator John Cogley	5	5	0

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Evaluations
Conference Annual Conference for the Colorado Park and Recreation Society **Session** New Models of Community Based Recreation for the Handicapped and Public Law 94-142 **Sponsor** Colorado Park and Recreation Society and Colorado Therapeutic Recreation Society	Sept. 22, 1976 Keystone, Colorado	Trainer John A. Nesbitt Coordinators John Cogley Marshall Banks Sandy Thomas	85	40	39
Consultation State Consultation on Community Recreation for Handicapped for the Colorado Therapeutic Recreation Society Executive Committee	Sept. 22, 1976 Keystone, Colorado	Trainer John A. Nesbitt Coordinator Sandy Thomas	8	8	0

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Evaluations
Work Group National Work Group on Model Recreation Service Delivery and Public Law 94-142 Sponsor National Consortium on Physical Education and Recreation for Handicapped, Conducted During Annual Meeting	Sept. 24, 1976 Bowman, Oregon	Trainers John A. Nesbitt Fred Humphrey and Others Coordinator Larry Neal	30	30	0
Work Group National Work Group on Model Recreation Service Delivery and Public Law 94-142 Sponsors National Recreation and Park Association National Therapeutic Recreation Society National Consortium on Physical Education and Recreation for Handicapped Council of State Presidents of the National Recreation and Park Association	Oct. 19-20, 1976 Boston, Mass.	Coordinator John A. Nesbitt	10	10	0

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Eval-ations
Conference 1976 Congress for Recreation and Parks (National) Session Education Session: Community Recreation for the Handicapped Sponsor National Recreation and Park Association	Oct. 20, 1976 Boston, Mass	Trainers Jackie Vaughan Jack Robinson Max Forman Patricia Pound Criss Cobb John A. Nesbitt Coordinators Jackie Vaughan Max Forman	284	180	154
Testimony Statement of Barriers to Participation by Handicapped and P.L. 90-480 at Public Hearings Conducted by the U.S. Architectural and Barriers Compliance Board	Oct. 21, 1976 Boston, Mass.	Presentor John A. Nesbitt Coordinator Paul Hippolitus	NA	NA	NA

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Evalations
State Institute Iowa Institute on Rural Recreation for Handicapped Youth Conducted by the National Institute in Cooperation with the Iowa CARI-Impact Project	Dec. 2, 1976 Fairfield, Iowa	Trainers John A. Nesbitt David J. Szymanski Tom Hoffman Roberta Kerr James Colgan Merry Matrie Marsha Yancy Coordinators David Szymanski Spence McKenney Randy Fulton	21	21	17
Regional Institute Regional (Mid-East) Institute on Recreation for Deaf-Blind Conducted by the B.E.H. Mid-Atlantic, North and Caribbean Regional Center and Services to Deaf-Blind Children	Jan. 11, 1977 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Trainer John A. Nesbitt and Others Coordinator David George	89	89	38
Consultation Consultation to Parents on CRH for Deaf-Blind (MANCRCSDBC)	Jan. 11, 1977 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Coordinator John A. Nesbitt Coordinator David George	2	1	NA

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Evalations
National Seminar National Seminar on Cultural Rights of Handicapped Conducted by the National Institute and the Committee on Recreation and Leisure of the U.S. President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped	Jan. 18, 1977 Washington, D.C.	Trainer John A. Nesbitt Coordinator Paul Hippolitus	12	12	NA
Work Group National Work Group on Model Recreation Service Delivery and P.L. 94-142	Jan. 18, 1977 Washington, D.C.	Consultants John A. Nesbitt Jerry Kelley David Park William Hillman Coordinator Paul Hippolitus	5	5	NA

Activity	Date/ Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Evaluations
Conference National Institute on Recreation for Handicapped in Rural Areas Sessions The State of the Art in Rural Recreation and Small Community Recreation for the Handicapped Boy Scouts Community Education for Handicapped Outdoor Special Recreation/ Education for Handicapped State Level Service Sponsors National Institute and Recreation and Leisure Studies Department of Southern University	Feb. 1, 1977 Southern Univ. Baton Rouge, Louisiana	Trainers Clifford Seymour William Hicks A.A. Pierro John A. Nesbitt Frank Lawrence, Jr. LeRoy Watt Bob Bell Gwen Bruton Resource Persons Jerry Hitzhusen Glen Thompson Karl Munson 15 State Extension Services David Szymanski Tom Hoffman Julian Stein Coordinator Clifford T. Seymour	52	42	30

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Eval-ations
Consultation State Consultation for Louisiana on APE Manpower and Curriculum Development Models (SU)	Feb. 2, 1977 Baton Rouge, Louisiana	Consultant John A. Nesbitt Coordinator Clifford Seymour	2	2	NA
Testimony Statement on Model Recreation Service Delivery in P.L. 94-142 at Public Hearings, Conducted by the U.S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped	Feb. 3, 1977 Washington, D.C.	Presentor John A. Nesbitt	NA	NA	NA
Regional Conference NRPA Southwest Regional Conference **Session** Educational Session: Community Recreation for Special Populations **Sponsor** Southwest Regional Council of the NRPA and National Recreation and Park Association	Feb. 27, 1977 Anaheim, California	Trainers/Coordinators Jackie Vaughan Jean Tague Janet Pomeroy	200	50	0

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Evaluations
Testimony Statement on Model Recreation SUPPORT Services Delivery on P.L. 94-142 at Hearings on Senate Bill 752 before the Senate Subcommittee on the Handicapped	March 21, 1977 Washington, D.C.	Presentor John A. Nesbitt	NA	NA	NA
Work Group National Work Group on Model Recreation Service Delivery and P.L. 94-142, National Consortium on Physical Education and Recreation for the Handicapped Spring Meeting	March 23-24, 1977 Seattle, Washington	Trainer John A. Nesbitt Coordinator Joe Teaff	50	50 Sets Materials Distributed at Training Workgroup	NA
Conference 1977 Midwest Symposium on Therapeutic Recreation Session National Institute on Community Recreation for the Handicapped Sponsor National Therapeutic Recreation Society of the National Recreation and Park Association	March 25, 1977 Rock Island, Illinois	Trainers David Szymanski Tom Hoffman Coordinators Jerry Hitzhusen Scout Lee Gunn Carol Peterson	50	50 Sets Materials Distributed at Training Sessions	15

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Evalations
Workshop "Let Us Live in Your World" Pre-Conference Workshop on Mainstreaming, Physical Activity and Recreation for Those with Special Needs **Session** The Community Recreation Mainstreaming Plan **Sponsors** Young Men's Christian Assoc. in Cooperation with American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation Ameican National Red Cross Bureau of Education for the Handicapped National Consortium on Physical Education and Recreation for Handicapped National Council of YMCA's YMCA of Southwest Washington **Organizer** Project Aquatics Mainstreaming, A BEH Project	March 24, 1977 Seattle, Washington	Trainers Linda Melvin John A. Nesbitt Ilene Ackner Kasson Coordinator Grace Reynolds	90	40	11

Activity	Date/Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Evaluations
Conference 1977 Southern Regional Recreation and Park Conference, "Tuning Up for Tomorrow" Sessions Mini-Conference VII Regional Institute on Community Recreation for Special Populations 1. Community Recreation for Special Populations: Theory and Practice 2. The Miami-Dade County Model 2. The Valdosta Model 3. Organization and Administration of Community Recreation for Special Populations 4. The Greensboro Model 5. Work Groups on Development of Community Recreation Programs for Handicapped Sponsors National Recreation and Park Association NRPA Southern Regional Council Georgia Recreation Park Society Savannah Department of Leisure Services Ft. Steward Recreation Services Georgia Department of Natural Resources	April 4, 1977 Savannah, Georgia	Trainers 1. John A. Nesbitt 2. James Ryan 2. Albert Howard 2. Barbara Wilhite 3. John A. Nesbitt 3. James Ryan 4. Bonnie Carswell 4. Lenora Sigman 5. John A. Nesbitt 5. Linda Melvin Coordinators James L. Regan Thad Studstill Max Forman	189	43	21

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Eval-ations
Conference Central District Alliance AAHPER Convention	April 13-16, 1977 Cheyenne, Wyoming	**Trainers** 1. John A. Nesbitt 1. Elva Hubbard	126	68	27
Sessions (Mini-Institute on Recreation and Recreation for Handicapped) 1. Recreation and Physical Education-Recreation for the Handicapped 2. Community Recreation for the Handicapped - Special Olympics 3. Physical Education for the Handicapped - A National Perspective 4. Physical Education for the Handicapped - A Local Perspective 5. Project Aquatics Mainstreaming		2. John A. Nesbitt 2. Elva Hubbard 2. Julian Stein 3. William Chasey 4. Leon J[illegible]son 5. Grace Reynolds **Coordinators** Dennis Flattre Dorothy High Roger Bishop			
Sponsors Central District of the AAHPER American Associaton for Health, Physical Education and Recreation					

Activity	Date /Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Evalations
Conference "A Time for Renaissance" NRPA New England Regional Conference Sessions 1. Integration of the Handicapped into the Community (Mainstreaming) 2. Adaptation of Recreational Activities 3. Financing Recreational Services to the Handicapped in the Community Sponsors New England Regional Council of the NRPA National Recreation and Park Association	April 18, 1977 Hyannis, Mass.	Trainers 1. John A. Nesbitt 1. Christine Reese 1. Myra Ivory 2. Hollis Fait 2. William Servedio 2. Fran Wallach 2. Joe Trapasso 3. John A. Nesbitt 3. Doris Arlen 3. Ilene Ackner Kasson Coordinator Jay Shivers	274	84	61

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Eval-ations
Regional Conference "The Joy of Leisure: Our Commitment to People" NRPA Pacific Northwest Regional and Park Conference Sessions 1. Community Based Recreation for Special Populations, Part I 2. Community Based Recreation for Special Populations, Part II Sponsors NRPA Pacific Northwest Region National Recreation and Park Association	May 2, 1977 Eugene, Oregon	Trainers 1. Catherine Ebbert 1. John A. Nesbitt 1. Grace Reynolds 2. John A. Nesbitt 2. Donna Iverson 2. Terry Hooten 2. Jack Newsom Coordinator Catherine Ebbert	201	61	60
Work Group Planning Work Group on National Forum on Commercial Recreation and the Handicapped	May 4, 1977 Washington, D.C.	Consultant John A. Nesbitt Coordinators Paul Hippolitus Helen Jo M. Hillman	8	8	NA

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Evaluations
Conference Annual Meeting of the U.S. President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped Session National Workshop In-Service Training Session on Recreation and Leisure for Handicapped Participation and Employment Sponsors National Institute and Committee on Recreation and Leisure of the U.S. President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped	May 4, 1977 Washington, D.C.	Trainers John A. Nesbitt Harold Snyder David M. Compton Dennis Vinton Coordinators Paul Hippolitus David Compton	115	61	37

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Eval-ations
Conference 1977 Mid-Eastern Symposium on Therapeutic Recreation Sessions 1. Model Community Programs for the Handicapped 2. In-Service Training in Leisure Services for the Handicapped Sponsor George Washington University University of Maryland Temple University in Cooperation with the National Therapeutic Recreation Society of the National Recreation and Park Assocation	May 12, 1977 Carrollton, Maryland	Trainers 1. John A. Nesbitt 1. Helen Jo Hillman 1. Karen Littman 1. Viki Annand 2. John A. Nesbitt 2. David Compton 2. Jerry Kelley 2. David Park Coordinators David Compton Jerry Kelley David Park Charles Butler	86	53	50
National Conference White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals	May 23-27, 1977 Washington, D.C.	Observer John A. Nesbitt	NA	NA	NA

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Eval-ations
National Conference Annual Meeting of the National Consortium on Physical Education and Recreation for the Handicapped; Session on "Implementation of the I.E.P. in P.L. 94-142" and "Model Community Based Recreation for Handicapped"	July 28-30, 1977 Kansas City, Missouri	Trainer John A. Nesbitt Coordinators Ernie Lange David Auxter	85 25	110 Sets of Materials Distributed at Meeting	0
Consultation Meeting of Board of Directors of American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities, Review of Formation of a Committee on Recreation and Leisure	Sept. 16-18, 1977 Chicago, Illinois	Consultant Cynthia Pradon Coordinator Eunice Fiorito	10	10 Sets of Materials Distributed at Meeting	0

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Evaluations
National Conference Annual Convention of the National Recreation and Park Association and National Therapeutic Recreation Society National Institute, Sessions on "PE and Recreation in P.L. 94-142 (A)" and on "Federal Funding for Recreation for Handicapped (B)"	Sept. 30- Oct. 10, 1977 MGM Grand Hotel and University of Nevada Las Vegas, Nevada	Trainers David Park William Chasey William Hillman and Others Resource Persons John A. Nesbitt Cynthia Pradon Coordinators David Park Jean Tague Jackie Vaughan	75 (A) 125 (B)	200 Sets of Materials Distributed at Training Sessions: 50 Requests Received (250)	Held by NRPA (50)
State Workshop "Workshop on Recreation and P.L. 94-142" Conducted by the Colorado Therapeutic Recreation Society	Dec. 9, 1977 National Jewish Hospital Denver, Colorado	Trainer John A. Nesbitt and Others Coordinators Sandy Thomas Lynn Thompson Judi Persoff	125	65 and 100 Sets of Materials Distributed at Training Workshop (165)	56

23

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Evalations
Regional Workshop Out-of-School Activities (Recreation, Play and Leisure Time) for Deaf-Blind Workshop Conducted by South Central Regional Center and Services to Deaf-Blind and Louisiana School for the Deaf	Dec. 14-16, 1977 Downtowner Hotel New Orleans, Louisiana	Consultant John A. Nesbitt Trainers George Hibbler Joseph Teaff David Compton Coordinators Jim West Jack English	78	100 Sets of Materials Distributed to Workshop Participants (also, 10 Sets of Selected Documents) (110)	42 Held by Center (42)
Regional Conference Southern District Conference of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Session on "Model Community Recreation and P.L. 94-142"	Feb. 25, 1978 Holiday Inn Convention Center, Little Rock, Arkansas	Trainer John A. Nesbitt Coordinator Clifford Seymour	85	75 Sets of Materials Distributed at Training Session 30 Requests (105)	56

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Eval-ations
Regional Conference Sixth Annual Conference on Physical Education and Recreation for the Handicapped: Individualized Education Programs and P.L. 94-142, Presentation on "Model Recreation Programs and Model Implementation of Recreation in P.L. 94-142".	March 29-30, 1978 Jackson State University Jackson, Mississippi	Trainer Steve Leclair Coordinator Melvin Evans	75	50 Sets of Materials Distributed at Training Session	Held by Conference (50)
State Conference Missouri Park and Recreation Society Annual State Conference Session on "Model Recreation Programs and Model Implementation of Recreation in P.L. 94-142"	March 29, 1978 Tan-Tar-A Lake of the Ozarks, Missouri	Trainer Cynthia Pradon Coordinator Mary Jo Brown Panelist Graham Williams	50	50 Sets of Materials Distributed at Training Session	0
State Conference Annual State Conference of Iowa Park and Recreation Association (Therapeutic Recreation Section), Session on "Model Recreation Programs and Model Implementation of Recreation in P.L. 94-142"	March 29-April 1, 1978 Sioux City, Iowa	Trainer Sue Flood Coordinators Ralph Rieks Becky Maddy Colleen Dowell	25	25 Sets of Materials Distributed at Training Session	0

Activity	Date / Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Evaluations
National Conference Annual National Convention of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation and its branch, American Association for Leisure and Recreation, Session on "Therapeutic Recreation, Model Programs in PE and Recreation for Handicapped and Model Recreation Implementation in P.L. 94-142"	April 9, 1978 Kansas City Convention Center, Kansas City, Missouri	Trainers John A. Nesbitt Sue Flood Panelists Carol Jenkins Victor Turner Coordinators Liane Summerfield Dorothy Canham	165	100 Sets of Materials Distributed at Training Session	Held by AAHPER (165)
Regional Conference Midwest Regional Conference of the National Recreation and Park Association Session on "Model Recreation Programs and Model Implementation of Recreation in P.L. 94-142"	April 30-May 3, 1978 Snow King Lodge, Jackson Hole, Wyoming	Trainer Cynthia Pradon and Others Coordinators Jean Dickinson Rose Hanglicek	50	50 Sets of Materials Distributed at Training Session	0
National Conference Annual Meeting of the U.S. President's Committee, Session on Model Recreation Programs and Services for Handicapped	May 5, 1978 Washington, Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.	Trainer John A. Nesbitt and Others Coordinator Paul Hippolitus	110	35 and 75 Sets of Materials Distributed at Training Session (110)	0

Activity	Date /Location	Faculty Resource Person	Number Attending	Number of Requests	Number of Evaluations
International Conference International Conference on Health and Lifestyle: 1978 Theme-Handicapped, Session on "New Models of Special Recreation" Sponsored by Vinland National Center and University of Minnesota	June 26, 1978 Miami, Florida M.S. Southward	Trainer John A. Nesbitt Coordinators Ancel Keys Arthur Leon Tore Dahl	60	60 Copies Paper Distributed to Participants	Held by Organizers (40)
National Conference Annual Meeting of the National Consortium on Physical Education and Recreation for the Handicapped: Sessions on "Update on Model Implementation of Recreation in P.L. 94-142" and "Preliminary Report on the B.E.H. National Institute on Special Recreation Models"	July 20-22, 1978 Stan Musiel's and Biggie's Hilton Inn, St. Louis, Missouri	Trainer John A. Nesbitt Panelists Sydney Post Fred Martin Coordinators Ernie Lange David Anxter	35 15	50 Sets of Materials Distributed at Training Session	0
TOTAL			3,339	2,401	742 (1) (347) 1,089

(1) There were 742 evaluations collected and analysed by the National Institute and 347 evaluations collected, and analysed and held by conference hosts or organizers for a total of 1,089 evaluations by participants.

III. Training Materials

In support of training activities and in pursuit of the objective of dissemination of new knowledge and insight into the delivery of community based recreation and leisure programs and services for handicapped children and youth, a wide range of original materials were prepared and disseminated and a number of materials were obtained from existing national, state and local resources to use in training activities and for dissemination.

The primary materials produced, obtained and disseminated are catalogued in the pages that follow. Summarizing, the following is reported.

Training Materials Used in Project

Original Materials Produced through Project	70
Quantity Used in Training/Disseminated	21,500
Materials Obtained from Resources	60
Quantity Used in Training/Disseminated	4,100

Training aids used in the project were prepared and disseminated in three phases coinciding with the implementation of the project. First, some fifty training aids and instruments were prepared for use at the National Conference on New Models and during the first year. Second, training aids based on the National Conference were prepared and used throughout the remaining two years of the National Institute Project. Finally, a series of training aids, in the form of National Institute Report numbers 1 through 9 were prepared for use in project training activities for continuing use in providing training in community recreation for handicapped or special recreation.

The following is a listing of major training aids, guides, etc. prepared through the National Institute Project.

#1 New Concepts and New Processes in Special Recreation, 156 pp.

#2 Model Special Recreation Services, 463 pp.

#3 Papers on New Models of Community or Special Recreation for Handicapped, 354 pp.

#4 Federal Funding for Special Recreation, 86 pp.

#5 Leisure Fulfillment for Handicapped and the White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals, 26 pp.

#6 Educating the Handicapped Child for Leisure Fulfillment, 133 pp.

#7 Special Recreation in Rural Areas, 188 pp

#8 Newsletters of the National Institute, 200 pp.

#9 Information Sources on Special Recreation, 177 pp.

#10 Report of the National Institute on New Models of Community Based Recreation and Leisure Programs and Services for Handicapped Children and Youth, 120 pp.

National Institute on Community Recreation for Handicapped		
The Project	**The Sponsor**	**The Implementor**
National Institute on New Models for Community Based Recreation Programs and Services for Handicapped Children and Youth	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare	John A. Nesbitt, Director, Recreation Education Program, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242 (Tel: 319/353-6708)

MATERIALS FOR DISSEMINATION

National Institute in Community Recreation for the Handicapped (& BEH Models Project)

___(002/____)"Special Projects," Concerning Purpose and Plans of National Institute on New Models for Community Based Recreation Programs and Services for Handicapped Children and Youth.
___(077/____)Press Release: "Nesbitt Directs National Community Recreation for Handicapped Project," (resume).
___(058/____)Message by Edward M. Mezvinsky Concerning National Institute.
___(074/____)Summary of Activities and Sources of Support for National Institute.
___(140/____)"Research Abstract Interests" of NICRH.
___(053/____)Press Release: "Community Recreation For Handicapped Planned At National Institute in Iowa City," July 7, 8, 9, 1976.
___(029/____)Logo of the NICRH.
___(068/____)Memorandum: John A. Nesbitt to Colorado Participants in Community Recreation for Handicapped Models Project Training and Consultation Activities of September 20-23, 1976; dates December 15, 1976.
___(052/____)Regional Institute Newsletter, No. 1; July 15, 1976.
___(000/____)Regional Institute Newsletter, No. 2; July 21, 1976.
___(049/____)Regional Institute Newsletter, No. 3; September 9, 1976.
___(076/____)Regional Institute Newsletter, No. 4; October 13, 1976.
___(050/____)Regional Institute Newsletter, No. 5; November 19, 1976.
___(017/____)Regional Institute Newsletter, No. 6; January 6, 1977.
___(003/____)Regional Institute Newsletter, No. 7; March 11, 1977.
___(005/____)Regional Institute Newsletter, No. 8; March 29, 1977.
___(000/____)Regional Institute Newsletter, No. 9; Pending.
___(000/____)Regional Institute Newsletter, No. 10; Pending.
___(037/____)"The Goals of Community Recreation for Handicapped," John A. Nesbitt.
___(021/____)"Recreation Activities for Handicapped (New, Used and Adapted)," NICRH.
___(004/____)"Leisure" - An Abstract of a Three-Year Project Submitted to The Unit on Physical Education and Recreation Bureau of Education for the Handicapped/ submitted by U of I Recreation Education Program.
___(089/____)Press Release: "University of Iowa Recreation Graduates Appointed At University's Hospital School," January 5, 1977.
___(073/____)Institute Evaluation Forms
___(340/____)NICRH Brochure; Summary of Goals and Purposes of the Special Projects.
___(058/____)NICRH: 1) Delivery Systems/Models for Community Recreation for Handicapped; 2) Handicapped Find.
___(449/____)Play, Recreation & Leisure for People Who Are Deaf-Blind; John A. Nesbitt.
___(001/____)"Leisure Fulfillment for Handicapped and The White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals, Part I - The Conference", John A. Nesbitt, 1977.

Community Models Descriptions

___(202/____)National Wheelchair Basketball Association - University of Kentucky; Lexington, Kentucky.
___(103/____)Berkeley Outreach Recreation Program; Berkeley, California.
___(114/____)Avocational Counseling for the Elderly; Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
___(129/____)Recreation Center for the Handicapped, Inc.; San Francisco, California.
___(099/____)Recreation Service Handicapped, Inc.; Memphis, Tennessee.
___(133/____)A Coordinated Approach to Community Recreation Services for Multiply Handicapped Adults; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
___(107/____)Leisure Services; Plainwell, Michigan.
___(145/____)The New York Association for the Blind; White Plains, New York.
___(201/____)Socio-Recreation Program for the Cerebral Palsy and/or Multiply Handicapped Individual; Hartford, Connecticut.
___(113/____)Maine-Niles Association of Special Recreation; Skokie, Illinois.
___(103/____)Nassau County Department of Recreation and Parks; East Meadow, New York.
___(141/____)Leisure Center/Portland Parks and Recreation Department; Portland, Maine.
___(197/____)Parks and Recreation Program for Special Populations; Wilmington, North Carolina.
___(220/____)ANCHOR (Answering the Needs of Children with Handicaps through Organized Recreation); Hempstead, New York.
___(089/____)Recreation Programs for the Handicapped; Miami, Florida.
___(105/____)Recreational Services for the Handicapped; Baltimore, Maryland.
___(104/____)Los Angeles County Parks and Recreation; Los Angeles, California.
___(111/____)King County Division of Parks and Recreation; Seattle, Washington.

Related Materials

___(091/____)International Symbol of Access for the Handicapped

___(006/____)"Recreation for Exceptional Children and Youth," Focus On Exceptional Children, Volume 6, No. 3, May 1974. John A Nesbitt, Larry L. Neal, and William A. Hillman, Jr.. Love Publishing Company, 1974.

___(002/____)Therapeutic Recreation Education: Developing a Competency-Based Entry-Level Curriculum. Jerry D. Kelley, Gary M. Robb, Wook Park, Kathleen J. Halberg. Illinois Community College Project. University of Illinois, 1976. 156 pages.

___(048/____)"White Oak Village," Recreational Activities for the Handicapped. Mountwood Park, West Virginia.

___(010/____)CIL (Center for Independent Living) - "The Facts."

___(022/____)CIL - "A Message."

___(003/____)CIL - The Independent, Volume 3, Number 2, Spring 1976.

___(000/____)CIL - "Berkeley Outreach History."

___(007/____)Orientation Institute on Community Recreation for the Handicapped - Application Form; Sponsored by New Jersey Department of Community Affairs.

___(028/____)City of Miami, Department of Parks and Recreation, Programs for the Handicapped (a listing).

___(016/____)City of Miami, Department of Parks and Recreation, Overview of the Programs for the Handicapped (February 1973 - May 1976).

___(068/____)City of Miami, Programs for the Handicapped - Leisure for the Handicapped Advocacy Models. Max R. Forman, Judith Faine. July 7, 1976.

___(017/____)City of Miami, Department of Parks and Recreation, "Directory of Recreational Programs for the Handicapped in Dade County - 1975-1976."

___(065/____)Boy Scouts of America, "Scout Programs for the Handicapped."

___(028/____)Boy Scouts of America, Bibliography of Relationships Division Material - Education Relationships Service (publications list), November, 1975.

___(048/____)"Specializing in Travel for the Handicapped, their relatives and friends," Ability Tours, Inc.

___(001/____)"Travel Barriers," U.S. Department of Transportation, 1970.

___(057/____)"Landscape Design to Accomodate the Handicapped," Jay Jorgensen. Distributed by the American Society of Landscape Architects Foundation.

___(047/____)"Barrier-Free Architecture: 'Yesterday's Special Design Becomes Tomorrow's Standard.'" AIA Journal, March 1975.

___(005/____)"Providing Community Recreational Opportunities for the Disabled," Shirley Bushell and Jerry D. Kelley. University of Illinois, June 1974.

___(003/____)"Federal Register," Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. December 30, 1976, Part IV: Education of Handicapped Children and Incentive Grants Program.

___(013/____)Project Aquatics. Grace Reynolds, Director. BEH, July 24, 1975.

___(029/____)Short Form for Models Description

PCEH-CRL Material*

___(150/____)"Recreation is For Handicapped People," 1975.
___(021/____)"Hiring the Handicapped."
___(016/____)"Management Views the Handicapped," Joseph P. Monge. An address at the Annual Conference, PCEH, Washington, D.C., May 3, 1968.
___(057/____)"Removing Barriers from the Pathways of the Handicapped. Reprinted by permission from Human Needs, February 1973 issue, and distributed by PCEH.
___(014/____)"Make the Bicentennial for All; Include Handicapped People."
___(058/____)"1976 Goal: Design for ALL Our Citizens..."
___(103/____)PCEH-CRL Newsletter: June-July 1973, No. 3. Employment of Handicapped in Recreation.
___(043/____)PCEH-CRL Newsletter: May-June 1975, No. 13. Designing Recreation Areas.
___(027/____)PCEH-CRL Newsletter: February-March 1976, No. 17. 1976 Olympiad for Handicapped.
___(012/____)PCEH-CRL Newsletter: Special Issue - Cultural Festival of the Handicapped Teaches a Valuable Lesson.
___(025/____)PCEH-CRL Newsletter: A Model State Committee on Recreation for Handicapped.
___(064/____)PCEH-CRL Newsletter: A Proclamation - The Leisure Needs of Handicapped People.
___(037/____)PCEH-CRL Newsletter: Section 504 and Recreation for Handicapped.
___(216/____)PCEH-CRL Newsletter: A Look at the Importance of Leisure for Handicapped People.

*Published by The Presidents Committee On Employment of the Handicapped (& Committee on Recreation and Leisure)

CARI-Impact

___(000/____)"Organizing Local Leisure Service Delivery Systems," by Dee W. Craig and Michael L. Teague.
___(122/____)"Recreational, Cultural and Leisure Services for the Handicapped in Rural Communities in Iowa," edited by David J. Szymanski.
___(139/____)"Development and Delivery of Leisure Service Programs to American Aging in Small Communities and Rural Areas," edited by Michael L. Teague.
___(224/____)"Citizen Service to Improve the Quality of Iowa's Leisure Lifestyle in Small Communities and the Rural Areas: The Board/Commission Member and the Volunteer," Journal of Iowa Parks and Recreation, Volume V, No. 4, 1976.
___(000/____)Women
___(000/____)Youth
___(000/____)Funding
___(000/____)Facility Planning
___(000/____)Arts

National Consortium on Physical Education and Recreation for Handicapped

___(101/___)Press Release: "Iowa's Nesbitt Elected President of Recreation For Handicapped Consortium;" National Consortium officers for 1976-77.

___(016/___)Memorandum: National Consortium Proposed Budget for 1976-77; September 15, 1976.

___(016/___)Memorandum No. 1: John A. Nesbitt to Consortium; General Information; September 25, 1976.

___(008/___)Memorandum No. 2: John A. Nesbitt to Consortium; General Information; December 22, 1976.

___(002/___)"Recreation Services for the Handicapped and Public Law 94-142; Testimony Presented February 3, Public Hearing on Public Law 94-142, Washington, D.C., by John A. Nesbitt.

___(004/___)"Leisure Assessment and Planning With the Person Who is Handicapped; A Basic Need and Process in Relation to Public Law 94-142, Education For All Handicapped Act of 1976," by John A. Nesbitt; May 12, 1976.

___(019/___)Denver Professional Preparation Conference Report, from John A. Nesbitt; September 10, 1976.

___(003/___)Schedule For Annual Meeting: National Consortium on Physical Education and Recreation for the Handicapped; September 23-25, 1976.

___(022/___)PCEH-CRL Newsletter: Testimony on Barriers to Handicapped Recreation Participation by John A. Nesbitt; Boston, Massachusetts; October 21, 1976.

___(001/___)Press Release: "Nesbitt Testifies on Barriers to Handicapped Recreation Participation by John A. Nesbitt; Boston, Massachusetts; October 2, 1976.

___(094/___)Memorandum: John A. Nesbitt to Selected Individuals and Consortium on Public Hearing on 94-142 to be held February 3, 1977; dates January 12, 1977.

___(095/___)Letter by John A. Nesbitt to Mr. Thomas B. Ervin; January 12, 1977.

___(048/___)Memorandum: John A. Nesbitt to Selected Individuals Concerning February 3 Public Hearing; February 1, 1977.

___(095/___)Memorandum: John A. Nesbitt to Consortium Concerning Testifying and Letter Writing on Public Law 94-142; February 4, 1977.

___(021/___)"Therapeutic Recreation Service Needs Related to Handicapped Children;" Statement submitted by John A. Nesbitt before U.S. Senate Subcommittee on the Handicapped, March 21, 1977; dated February 24, 1977.

___(016/___)"Therapeutic Recreation Service Needs Related to Handicapped Children;" Summary submitted by John A. Nesbitt before U.S. Senate Subcommittee on the Handicapped, March 21, 1977; dated February 24, 1977.

___(032/___)Memorandum: John A. Nesbitt to Selected Individuals Concerning Past, Current, and Proposed Activity Regarding Public Law 94-142; April 2, 1977.

___(250/___)Telegram to Joseph Califano, Secretary of Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Uring Release of 504 Regulations; April 12, 1977.

Distribution of Materials

Sample Distribution of National Institute Materials

Distribution of National Institute Report #6-1,400 copies "Educating the Handicapped Child for Leisure Fulfillment" First Printing 150, second, 1,000; third, 150; Georgia Printing, 100.

	Copies Sent
Federal Level	
House Select Committee on Education	10
Senate Subcommittee on Handicapped	5
U.S. Bureau of Education for Handicapped, DPP	100
U.S. National Advisory Committee on Handicapped	15
Dr. Ed Martin and Staff	5
Final Report to BEH on National Institute Project	10
Distribution of Final Report on National Institute Project	50
Federal Agencies (RSA, DD, OHI, etc.)	10
National Organizations	
National Coordinating Committee NTRS, NCPERH, NRPA	15
National Consortium on Physical Education and Recreation for Handicapped	110
National Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children and Adults	5
National Information Centers (CEC,IRUC,TRIC, etc.)	10
University Training Institutes/Workshops	
North Texas State University	25
Jackson State University	50
National Recreation and Park Association	
Midwest Regional Conference	40
Annual Congress	40
Northwest Regional Conference	40
Southwest Regional Conference	40
New England Regional Conference	40
Southern Regional Conference	40
American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation	
Central District Conference	
Annual Convention	50
Southern District Conference	50
State Park and Recreation Associations	
Colorado Therapeutic Recreation Society	100
Missouri Park and Recreation Association State Conference	40
Iowa Park and Recreation State Conference	20

	Copies Sent
State Level	
State Division of Special Education (2 each)	100
State Park and Recreation Associations (2 each)	100
State Health, Physical Education and Recreation Consultants (1 each)	50
State Developmental Disabilities and Special Education, Georgia	125
Individual Requests	
Individual Requests, Special Education, Physical Education, Recreation	95
Stock	
Held in Reserve	10

IV. Training Evaluation

by Ms. Carla Caudill, B.E.H. Project Assistant and
Mr. Steve Leclair, B.E.H. Research Assistant

A standard survey form was utilized as a participant generated evaluation method at seventeen of the Institute's training programs. This survey form consisted of thirteen questions arranged under three major headings:

A. Institute/Session Presentations
B. Quality of Interaction
C. Institute/Session Organization

The areas covered under the first section (also corresponding to the question number) were:

(1) presentation of the models
(2) guidelines, goals and statements
(3) printed brochures and materials
(4) audio-visual materials used
(5) lectures and presentations

The second area, Quality of Interaction, included the following areas of evaluation:

(6) opportunity to ask questions and respond to presentations
(7) opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants
(8) opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact.

The third area, Institute/Session Organization, included these areas:

(9) participant's understanding of the institute
(10) institute/session facilities
(11) institute/session publicity
(12) institute/session staff work
(13) institute/session operation

Each of these 13 questions were rated by the participant on a one-to-five scale with one (1) being a rating of very negative, two (2) being a rating of negative, three (3) being a rating of satisfactory, four (4) being a rating of positive and five (5) being a rating of very positive.

The overall rating, looking at the compilation of the ratings of all presentations and all questions was a 3.8, or a rating between satisfactory and positive, slightly closer to positive. There were many differences in over-all ratings of the program from presentation to presentation. They range from a rating of 3.1 (Rock Island, Illinois) to 4.8 (Fairfield, Iowa).

Turning our attention to the individual questions, we will look at these questions in the area of Institue/Session Presentations first. The presentation of the models had an over-all weighted average (correcting for unequal n's) of 3.8 for the 17 presentations, which is the same as the total rating. The means for guidelines, goals and statements and utilization of audio-visual materials was related similarly to the total rating being slightly higher and lower respectively. The lectures and presentations and printed brochures and materials received ratings substantially above the total rating. To summarize, it appears that the participants felt the presentations and materials used were quite positive.

In the second area, quality of interaction, the opportunity to ask questions and the ability to exchange socially were rated somewhat more highly than their opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants.

The ratings to the questions in the third area, Institute/Session Organization, were all very close to the total mean of 3.8 except for one. Facilities and publicity both were rated 3.7. Although this rating is between satisfactory and positive, keeping in mind the number of presentations being rated, being the lowest rating is significant in itself. Attention should be focused on this area in terms of future presentations.

The participants were asked to write any comments they may have had about the mechanics, content or other aspects of the presentations. The following is a list of the most recurring recommendations:

1. Information was requested on how to motivate communities without leisure programs for the handicapped to initiate such programs.

2. There was a feeling that the institutes should be geared toward solving practical community problems in integrating the disabled into existing recreation programs.

3. Participants felt that the presentation should deal with programs for specific disability and age group.

4. A strong interest was expressed in starting organizations to bring recreation for both the non-handicapped and the handicapped to rural areas.

5. There was a general consensus that the sessions should be longer to do justice to the information and to provide more time for exchange among participants.

In summary, it appears, on the basis of the responses to these evaluation forms, that the presentations have been successful in terms of their quality of presentation, reinforcement of professional interaction and particular purposes and end goals. While there was a significant range of ratings to the programs, no over-all rating either per question or per program was less than satisfactory. Areas of improvement may include more efficient publicity, increased opportunity for professional interaction and more utilization of varying modalities of presentation, i.e. audio-visual, etc.

VIII. Name of Institute: ______________________

National Institute Community Recreation for Handicapped		
The Project	The Sponsor	The Implementor
National Institute on New Models for Community Based Recreation Programs and Services for Handicapped Children and Youth	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare	John A. Nesbitt, Project Director, Recreation Education Program, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242 (tel: 319/353-6808)

EVALUATION FORM

Please complete this form.

______________________________________ | ______________
Name of Respondent (to be used in sending follow-up materials) | Date

______________________________ | ______________________
Title (Role) | Unit/Bureau

____
Agency/Organization

______________________________________ | ______________
Address: Street/Building | City

______________________ | ________ | ______________________
State | Zip | Telephone (include Area Code)

Background Data on Evaluator

Profession: (Check One)

- ___ Adapted Physical Education
- ___ Physical Education
- ___ Recreation
- ___ Parks
- ___ Parks and Recreation
- ___ Municipal/Community Recreation
- ___ Therapeutic Recreation
- ___ Special Education
- ___ Occupational Therapy
- ___ Physical Therapy
- ___ Social Work
- ___ Speech Therapy
- ___ Other

Title: (Check One)

- ___ Administrator
- ___ Consultant
- ___ Supervisor/Consultant
- ___ Leader
- ___ Technician/Aide
- ___ Volunteer
- ___ Principal
- ___ Teacher
- ___ Other

Population Served (Check where appropriate)	Age	0-2	2-5	6-12	13-15	16-19	20-30	31-45	46-61	62 +
Non-Handicapped										
Aged with Impairments										
Blind & Visually Handicapped										
Deaf & Hard of Hearing										
Deaf-Blind										
Drug Problems										
Learning Disabilities										
Mentally Retarded-Trainable										
Mentally Retarded-Educable										
Physically Handicapped										
Speech & Communication Impairments										
Social Offenders-Adult										
Social Offenders-Youth										
Other Health Impairments										

Check closest amount of the Institute/Session you were able to attend:

___1/4 ___1/2 ___3/4 ___full Institute/Session

The Institute/Session and Materials

Please check in appropriate box:
0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Positive
5 - Very Positive

Institute/Session Presentations

My rating of the

	0	1	2	3	4	5
...presentation of models is						
...guidelines, goals, statements is						
...printed brochures and materials is						
...audio-visual materials used is						
...lectures and presentations is						

Quality of Interaction

My rating of the

...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations, is						
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants is						
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact is						

Institute/Session Organization

My understanding of the Institute/Session objectives was						

My rating of the

...Institute/Session facilities is						
...Institute/Session publicity is						
...Institute/Session staff work is						
...Institute/Session operation is						

Comments, Needs, Observations

Please comment about the Institute/Session, your current needs, etc., as you see fit. We will send information in answer to your requests.

Mean Ratings for each Evaluation Item for each Presentation

Question	Iowa City July 7-9, 1976 n=14	Ft. Logan Sept. 26, 1976 n=14	Keystone Sept. 22, 1976 n=39	Boston Oct. 2, 1976 n=154
1. Presentation of the models.	2.7	3.8	3.6	4.5
2. Guidelines, goals and statements.	1.7	3.9	3.9	4.1
3. Printed brochures and materials.	3.1	3.1	4.1	-
4. Audio-visual materials used.	2.5	3.3	3.1	-
5. Lectures and presentations.	1.8	3.8	3.8	-
6. Opportunity to ask questions and respond to presentations.	3.1	4.3	3.4	-
7. Opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants.	4.0	3.6	2.8	-
8. Opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact.	4.5	3.5	2.9	-
9. Participant's understanding of the institute.	3.2	3.5	3.5	-
10. Institute/session facilities.	4.0	4.2	3.8	-
11. Institute/session publicity.	3.3	4.3	3.5	-
12. Institute/session staff work.	4.4	4.3	3.4	-
13. Institute/session operation.	4.0	4.3	3.5	-
Overall rating	3.3	3.4	3.4	4.3

Mean Ratings for each Evaluation Item for each Presentation

Question	Fairfield Dec. 2, 1976 n=17	Philadelphia Jan. 11, 1977 n=38	Baton Rouge, Feb. 1-2, 1977 n=30	Rock Island March 25, 1977 n=15
1. Presentation of the models.	4.7	-	3.9	2.9
2. Guidelines, goals and statements.	4.5	4.6	4.0	3.1
3. Printed brochures and materials.	4.3	4.0	4.3	3.0
4. Audio-visual materials used.	3.7		3.9	3.1
5. Lectures and presentations.	-	3.5	4.2	3.1
6. Opportunity to ask questions and respond to presentations.	-		4.2	3.5
7. Opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants.	4.5	3.5	4.0	3.3
8. Opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact.	-	2.9	4.0	3.2
9. Participant's understanding of the institute.	4.6	4.3	4.0	3.2
10. Institute/session facilities.	-	-	3.9	2.9
11. Institute/session publicity.	-	-	3.9	2.9
12. Institute/session staff work.	5.0	-	4.1	3.0
13. Institute/session operation.	-	-	4.1	2.9
Overall rating	4.8	3.7	4.1	3.1

Mean Ratings for each Evaluation Item for each Presentation

Question	Seattle March 24, 1977 n=11	Savannah April 7, 1977 n=21	Cheyenne #1 April 13-16, 1977 n=8	Cheyenne #2 April 13-16, 1977 n=9
1. Presentation of the models.	4.1	4.1	3.4	3.5
2. Guidelines, goals and statements.	4.3	4.0	3.8	3.8
3. Printed brochures and materials.	4.6	4.2	3.0	3.5
4. Audio-visual materials used.	4.5	4.0	3.3	4.0
5. Lectures and presentations.	4.2	3.7	4.0	4.1
6. Opportunity to ask questions and respond to presentations.	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.3
7. Opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants.	3.9	4.4	4.5	4.1
8. Opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact.	3.9	4.2	4.7	4.3
9. Participant's understanding of the institute.	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.3
10. Institute/session facilities.	4.3	3.9	3.7	3.9
11. Institute/session publicity.	3.7	3.8	3.6	4.3
12. Institute/session staff work.	4.5	4.0	4.3	3.6
13. Institute/session operation.	4.5	4.2	4.0	4.3
Overall rating	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.0

Mean Ratings for each Evaluation Item for each Presentation

Question	Cheyenne #3 April 13-16, 1977 n=3	Cheyenne #4 April 13-16, 1977 n=7	Hyannis #1 April 18, 1977 n=26	Hyannis #2 April 18, 1977 n=19
1. Presentation of the models.	3.0	4.8	3.2	3.7
2. Guidelines, goals and statements.	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.1
3. Printed brochures and materials.	3.7	5.0	4.5	3.3
4. Audio-visual materials used.	3.0	4.5	4.3	2.9
5. Lectures and presentations.	3.3	4.5	4.3	3.9
6. Opportunity to ask questions and respond to presentations.	4.0	5.0	4.2	3.9
7. Opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants.	3.5	4.5	3.9	3.5
8. Opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact.	3.5	3.5	4.5	3.6
9. Participant's understanding of the institute.	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9
10. Institute/session facilities.	3.5	4.5	3.8	3.6
11. Institute/session publicity.	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.5
12. Institute/session staff work.	4.0	4.5	4.3	3.9
13. Institute/session operation.	4.0	4.5	4.2	3.7
Overall rating	3.7	4.4	3.4	3.5

Mean Ratings for each Evaluation Item for each Presentation

Question	Hyannis #3 April 18, 1977 n=16	Eugene #1 May 2, 1977 n=53	Eugene #2 May 2, 1977 n=7	Washington May 1, 1977 n=37
1. Presentation of the models.	4.0/3.8	3.9	3.6	3.5
2. Guidelines, goals and statements.	4.5/4.0	4.1	4.3	3.9
3. Printed brochures and materials.	4.0/4.1	4.5	4.9	3.3
4. Audio-visual materials used.	5.0	4.3	-	3.6
5. Lectures and presentations.	4.5/4.2	4.3	-	3.7
6. Opportunity to ask questions and respond to presentations.	5.0	4.2	-	3.9
7. Opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants.	3.0	3.9	-	3.3
8. Opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact.	3.0	4.5	-	3.1
9. Participant's understanding of the institute.	3.0	3.9	-	3.7
10. Institute/session facilities.	2.0/3.7	3.8	4.3	3.4
11. Institute/session publicity.	3.3	3.8	-	3.0
12. Institute/session staff work.	3.5	4,3	-	2.8
13. Institute/session operation.	3.5	4.2	-	3.7
Overall rating	3.5/4.0	4.1	4.3	3.5

Mean Ratings for each Evaluation Item for each Presentation

Question	(A) Carrollton #1 May 12, 1977 n=15	(B) Carrollton #1 May 12, 1977 n=17	Carrollton #2 May 12, 1977 n=18	Denver Dec. 9, 1977 n=56
1. Presentation of the models.	3.7	4.3	3.9	3.7
2. Guidelines, goals and statements.	3.8	-	-	3.8
3. Printed brochures and materials.	4.0	-	-	4.6
4. Audio-visual materials used.	3.8	-	-	3.5
5. Lectures and presentations.	3.7	4.2	4.1	3.7
6. Opportunity to ask questions and respond to presentations.	4.1	3.8	3.8	3.9
7. Opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants.	3.5	2.8	3.5	3.0
8. Opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact.	3.8	-	-	3.6
9. Participant's understanding of the institute.	3.5	-	-	4.1
10. Institute/session facilities.	3.3	-	-	4.0
11. Institute/session publicity.	3.5	-	-	3.8
12. Institute/session staff work.	3.8	4.1	3.4	3.9
13. Institute/session operation.	3.9	-	-	3.9
Overall rating	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.8

Mean Ratings for each Evaluation Item for each Presentation

Question	Little Rock Feb. 25, 1977 n=56		Mean Score All	
1. Presentation of the models.	3.9		3.8	
2. Guidelines, goals and statements.	3.7		3.9	
3. Printed brochures and materials.	4.4		3.9	
4. Audio-visual materials used.	3.7		3.7	
5. Lectures and presentations.	4.0		3.8	
6. Opportunity to ask questions and respond to presentations.	4.3		4.0	
7. Opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants.	3.4		3.6	
8. Opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact.	3.6		3.7	
9. Participant's understanding of the institute.	3.9		3.9	
10. Institute/session facilities.	4.1		3.7	
11. Institute/session publicity.	3.7		3.7	
12. Institute/session staff work.	4.0		4.0	
13. Institute/session operation.	4.0		4.0	
Overall rating	3.9	Mean Score All 3.8	3.8	

Report on Evaluation of National Institute

by Mary Palmberg, BEH Models Project Assistant

An evaluation instrument related to the goals and objectives of the National Institute was not designed nor implemented during the National Institute. (This instrument would have been similar to the instrument used in relation to the National Institute on Recreation for Deaf-Blind.) Rather, the evaluation instrument designed by Dr. Nesbitt for use in the Regional Training Institutes and at Special Training Sessions was used by the participants to perform evaluation. The instrument designed by Dr. Nesbitt had been included in the workbook for the purpose of receiving the National Faculty's reactions and suggestions for improvement of that instrument. However, based on the absence of a special instrument related to the National Institute and the desire to receive immediate feedback from the participants in the National Institute, the tentative Regional Institute instrument was used. What follows is a report on the reaction, ratings and responses of participants using that instrument. During the second quarter of 1976-77 an instrument appropriate to the National Institute will be designed based on similar instruments and sent to the National Institute participants to obtain their ratings and comments.

Tabulation of the 14 responses received at the BEH Models National Institute in July 1976 showed, in general, a desire for a longer institute, a need for greater emphasis on a few selected topics and/or programs rather than skimming of several, praise for the work of the Institute staff, and satisfaction with the amounts and quality of social interaction afforded Institute participants.

More specifically, in regard to individual ratings of Institute presentations, one-third to one-half had "no response" as their rating of the presentations. Half of those responding had a positive reaction to the presentation of the Models and of the guidelines, goals, and statements. About 45 percent of those responding gave a "very positive" rating to the printed brochures and materials and the AV materials used. Overall, participants indicated by their ratings and comments that their evaluations of Institute presentations would be facilitated by the perspective of a few months, allowing them to evaluate the Institute's presentations in the light of the effects on their own programs. It was also noted by several that the scheduling of workshops and smaller group meetings simultaneously with the Institute sessions did not allow effective evaluation of some aspects of Institute presentations.

As for quality of interaction, two out of three of the categories received a "very positive" rating by over half of the participants. About 30% gave a very positive rating to the opportunity to ask questions and respond to presentations; some attributed the lack of opportunity to respond to the fast pace of the Institute. Almost 80% rated the opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants as "positive" or "very positive;" 93% gave that rating to opportunities for social exchange.

Ratings of Institute organization were predominantly positive. Ninety-three percent gave "positive" or "very positive" ratings to Institute staff work.

In summary, a review of the tabulations of ratings and comments on the Institute and materials indicates a desire on the part of most Institute participants for a more in-depth, thorough treatment of one or two problem areas. Many pointed out a critical need in the area of program development; several would have preferred greater focus on the "how-to" of the development of a recreation program for handicapped in a small town. A need for a more concentrated focus, then closure, on one or two problem areas rather than a cursory treatment of many topics was mentioned by many participants. Likewise, briefer, more concise materials were mentioned as possibly aiding in this clarification of program focus. Some pointed out a need for better preparation, so that participants would have a very clear idea of what was expected of them at the Institute. For many, the ideas and discussion afforded by the provisions for information and social exchange by participants was a most beneficial part of the Institute.

The following table synopsizes the ratings summarized above.

0=no response/omit 1=very negative(limited) -------- 5=very positive(high)

				n=14		
Institute Presentations	0	1	2	3	4	5
My rating of the						
...presentation of models is	6*	2	0	2	4	0
...guidelines, goals, statements, is	3	1	1	3	4	2
...printed brochures and materials is	3	1	0	2	3	5
...audio-visual materials used is	5	0	1	2	2	4
...lectures and presentations is.	5	2	1	4	2	0
Quality of Interaction						
My rating of the						
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations, is	0	3	2	3	2	4
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants is	0	2	1	0	3	8
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact is	0	1	0	0	3	10
Institute Organization						
My understanding of the Institute objectives was	0	3	1	2	6	2
My rating of the						
...Institute facilities is	0	1	0	3	4	6
...Institute publicity is	1	1	0	2	6	3
...Institute staff work is	1	0	0	0	3	10
...Institute operation is	0	0	1	3	5	5

*numbers indicate number of responses giving that rating in the stated category

In another section of the instrument, respondents were asked to rate the impact they foresaw the Institute and its materials having on the initiation, improvement and expansion of community recreation and leisure opportunity for handicapped. The table that follows gives a synopsis of the ratings. The relatively large number of ratings in the "no response" category may be taken as an indication of a reluctance on the part of the respondents to judge, at the time of the Institute, what impact might be felt in succeeding months.

0=no response/omit   1=very limited impact   5=very high impact

n=14

Institute materials/content	0	1	2	3	4	5
The "12" delivery systems idea	6*	0	0	2	4	2
Descriptions of Models	5	0	0	3	5	1
The activities listed	5	2	0	3	0	4
The guidelines on administration	5	1	1	1	3	3
The guidelines on development	5	1	1	1	3	3
The training resource syllabus	5	1	0	2	2	4
The Charter on Recreation and Leisure for Handicapped	5	1	0	3	3	2
The 10-year goals statement	5	1	0	0	2	6
The advocacy statement	5	1	1	0	2	5
The planning statement	5	1	0	0	4	4

*numbers indicate number of responses giving that rating in the stated category

The following is a reporting of the actual comments made by respondents.

"Well-organized, fast moving, vital participants. Sets stage for continued comprehensive planning on national basis. Sets up framework for future detailing and documentation."

"I would have liked to have been able to listen to and react to all of the presentations. There was too much paper work. I think that a few detailed video-tape sessions would have had more impact than many short ones."

"Few Institute materials. More concrete objectives. More time to prepare for video-taping sessions."

"We couldn't hear (lectures and presentations); were in our own group working."

"Did not hear/see (presentation of Models, audio-visual materials, lectures and presentations); was in work groups. (Institute facilities) not accessible."

"(Presentation of Models)not clear. Thought we would have lecture presentation of each person's model, thereby draw upon expertise/knowledge to go back and more intelligently fill out workbook. Cannot do Delivery Systems comments objectively. No true presentations at which to ask questions of participants. (Institute objectives) not totally defined. I would like to have seen national leaders present their areas of expertise with other participants reacting, questioning, etc. Felt this would have been very valuable. Thought we were going to talke about everyone's program, react and then draw up a universal set of guidelines for each model to be follows, e.g., Janet Pomeroy's program would be a general model for Parks and Recreation Models. Then each center would be availed of past experience and procedures Janet has used and feels vital to future programs.

"Perhaps if there were another institute I would like to see panels set up for different models (with well-known programs and those not so well-known). Exchange of ideas, zeroing in on a particular problem, e.g., personnel, how-to, where to set up, etc. Tape these on video-tape or cassette. Have available on national levels to be made use of by prospective programs. Along with written materials, e.g., Janet's book. (Maybe this is what you already plan to do? I wasn't sure.)"

"Travel arrangements (plane booking, hotel reservations, limo pick-up) were excellent. Students did a marvelous job. Institute tried to cover too many areas so quality of coverage suffered. Would have been better to have covered fewer topics and covered them well and in-depth. Critical need is in the area of program development."

"1)Needed more pre-Institute information more clearly presented (this is individual to me). 2) Wish panels had been presented to entire audience--so could have gotten information. 3) Extend Institute with same amount of work to one week (at least). 4) Good time to meet other recreation professionals and exchange information. 5) Felt some good suggestions, ideas, and information resulted from the conference. Hope to see results of Institute in the coming year.

*The staff of the Institute has been excellent, They have really made the Institute participants feel welcome and have been willing to take us many places and make our visit very easy. Thank you."

"I feel that the idea of the Institute is very good. However, the materials presented prior to the Institute were rather vague. Future institutes should be conducted in a manner that the participants will know what is expected of them when they come. The taping should be spontaneous or the participants should be told what speeches they are to make and to prepare speeches of a certain time. I do feel that the Institute staff went out of their way to make the participants comfortable while attending. I do not think that a better staff could have been assembled."

(regarding the Institute presentations)"Too much materials to be able to react intelligently in time allotted. (Very Positive response to)Janet Pomeroy (concerning audio-visual materials used). There were very few presentations."

"(Institute materials/content should be) briefer and concise."

"(Regarding response to Institute presentations) waiting to see; I'm afraid they may be too superficial. I cannot comment (on impact) without the final products of this Institute."

"(Amount of printed brochures and materials) overwhelming. Integrating presentations with work groups took away from the presentations. (Opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants possible) during break, etc., but no definite time provided in Institute. (Concerning publicity) got my notice late. (Regarding Institute operation) there should be some way to get participants to attend sessions on time. The Institute can be enhanced if less is attempted at one time. Although the Institute members worked hard, there could have been more closure if fewer things were focused on. There is no doubt in my mind that the process to assess the field and come up with some degree of concensus was adequately utilized."

5

"We couldn't hear (lectures and presentations); were in our own group working. I don't think these (specific aspects of Institute materials/content) will be as beneficial now as they will later when all things get pulled together. We received input and got feedback from only a few others that we worked with. Time was spent in working and not in pursuing program.

Considering the task to be accomplished, the Institute was run extremely well. I think the taping would have been better off being done in a small room off from work groups. I'll be looking forward to seeing results of other work."

General Comm[illegible] and Suggestions from Ins[illegible]rticipants

Municipal In-Service Training
Session in CRH (Ft. Logan)

1. Please send me the information on "the Community Material". In the Denver area we receive no support from the Denver Parks and Recreation Department nor from the City Government; just a few dollars.

2. The CTRS is this year emphasizing Recreational Therapy in the community setting. As President of CTRS this year, any information you can periodically send to help us keep informed would be extremely helpful. If we can help you in any way, please inform me.

3. Leisure counseling for physically and mentally handicapped is one of my main interests, and would like as much information on this as possible. There was too much covered for so little time. I would have liked Mr. Nesbitt to go into more detail.

4. Information for children's hospitals related to physically handicapped.

5. Can we get copies of the different models? The visibility was poor particularly the community-based programs for youth.

6. I am interested in the different types of programs for the elderly and for children who are disabled. Also, the type of recreation used.

7. Research related areas--mostly university?
   Employment--potentialities, models for REC students.
   Programming-delivery competencies--T.R.
   Sports, arts, recreation for handicapped.
   Interested in handicapped of all ages.
   Lacking information on rehabilitation (prisons), pathology (emotional, psychiatric)

8. I am sorry that I am unable to add to your survey, but I am not employed at this time, as I have just moved here from Kansas City, Missouri.

9. As evaluation, having the overhead viewer on while you were speaking early in the lecture (3/4 it was actually used) was very destracting. Also, having you speak to the screen rather than the audience for such a long time while the lights were down was distracting.

   I would greatly appreciate a copy of the form you used as a model during the lecture, as well as information on ANCHOR? In Hempstead, New York; Berkeley Project.

10. Not enough information given during presentations. I am interested in Therapeutic Recreation, community centers in actual existence, would have enjoyed hearing about such. I work in Psychiatry. Are there leisure guidance agencies in my community for such a population?

Ft. Logan Institute Comments cont...

11. Materials not available in quantity. Very poor projection.

12. I am very interested in finding out programs in regard to the mentally ill and handicapped people with emotional problems. I have no idea of what types of programs are going on, particularly in Colorado.

13. I would really like information on the various models on community recreation for the handicapped.

14. I need materials for use in educating people who will go out into the field in various capacities to work with handicapped, i.e. models of existing programs,,copy of Public Law 94-142, list of 300 plus activities, community check lists, evaluation models--two classes in recreation are attending this seminar and will rehash materials and presentation later.

15. Please send two copies of each model.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: **State In-Service Training Session** NUMBER ATTENDING: 85

PLACE: **Keystone, Colorado** NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 40

DATE: **September 22, 1977** NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 39

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	3.6	36	3	0	2/06	15/41	14/39	5/14
...guidelines, goals, statements	3.9	35	4	0	3/09	4/12	21/57	8/23
...printed brochures and materials	4.1	30	9	0	2/07	3/10	15/50	10/10
...audio-visual materials used	3.1	32	7	3/09	6/19	9/28	12/38	2/06
...lectures and presentations	3.8	36	3	0	4/11	12/33	9/25	11/31
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	3.4	36	3	0	5/14	12/33	17/47	2/06
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	2.8	33	6	2/06	11/33	12/36	7/21	1/04
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	2.9	28	11	2/07	9/32	9/32	6/22	2/07
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	3.5	27	12	0	4/15	7/26	15/56	1/03
...institute/session facilities	3.8	28	11	0	2/08	6/21	16/57	4/14
...institute/session publicity	3.5	29	10	1/04	1/04	15/52	10/32	4/14
...institute/session staff work	3.4	27	12	0	3/11	10/37	10/37	4/15
...institute/session operation	3.5	28	11	0	3/11	12/43	10/35	3/11

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: **Municipal In-Service Training Session in Community Recreation for the Handicapped.** NUMBER ATTENDING: 75

PLACE: **Ft. Logan, Colorado (Denver)** NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 66

DATE: **September 20, 1976** NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 14

The Institute/Session and Materials:
0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	3.8	13	1	0	1/ 7	4/31	4/31	4/31
...guidelines, goals, statements	3.9	11	3	0	0	4/36	4/36	3/28
...printed brochures and materials	3.1	9	5	1/11	1/11	4/44	2/23	1/11
...audio-visual materials used	3.3	14	0	3/21	2/14	1/ 7	4/29	4/29
...lectures and presentations	3.8	12	2	1/ 8	2/17	0	5/42	4/33
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	4.3	6	8	0	0	1/17	2/33	3/50
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	3.6	5	9	0	1/20	1/20	2/40	1/20
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	3.5	6	8	0	1/17	2/33	2/33	1/17
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session facilities	3.5	4	10	1/25	0	0	2/50	1/25
...institute/session facilities	4.2	6	8	0	0	2/33	1/17	3/50
...institute/session publicity	4.3	4	10	0	0	1/25	1/25	2/50
...institute/session staff work	4.3	3	11	0	0	1/34	0	2/66
...institute/session operation	4.3	3	11	0	0	1/34	0	1/66

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments and Suggestions from Institute Participants

State In-Service Training
Session CRH (Colorado)

1. I am interested in receiving information concerning L.D. and work with the handicapped. I will be doing my internship at New England Children's Hospital in Boston. I would appreciate receiving packets that were passed out at the session so that I may present them to neighboring towns. I live five miles southeast of Boston.

2. The overheads were illegible, so they were of no value. The lecture or presentation was far too rushed and disjointed allowing little time for comprehension, interaction, or meaningful questioning. The slide show was fine.

3. Too many facts and figures.

4. Please send me more information on approaching the community; how does one get federal funds, plus special activities and programs. It was very interesting, but I wish we had had all day to find out all the new ideas and approaches!

5. It was a very good presentation; what I have been looking for. I will assess my needs and let you know.

6. Need more time.

7. Not enough printed material to go around. It was hard to see the projection. I would have prefered more time to cover material presented.

8. Commendable.

9. I would like to receive the Gold Sheet on "National Institute on new Models for Community Recreation and Leisure for Handicapped Children and Youth."

10. If you have information on training programs for children with motor learning disabilities, I would appreciate it if you would send it.

11. Time was so limited and there was too much helpful information to go over so fast.

12. The presentation was informative and the brochures will be helpful. I would like and appreciate any information on recreation programs, activities for adults (ages 18 on up) with emotional and psychiatric problems.

Colorado Institute Comments cont...

13. The presentation was most beneficial. I would like to become more involved.

14. I am trying to get into therapeutic recreation.

15. I liked Dr. Nesbitt's presentation. He was excellent, as was Morgan.

16. I need information available on grants for the handicapped. Individualized evaluation forms that can be examined by community lay people which gives a close-up view of improvements made in the area of ill and handicapped; especially interested in the amount of tax dollars spent for the handicapped and how much for recreation alone.

17. I would like to receive a packet in order to use for reference in my fieldwork and to send it on to the hospital where I did my internship this past summer. Dr. Nesbitt's presentation was very informative.

18. We are serving all ages of acute handicapped youth and need to have knowledge of facilities and programs in the community that they and their families can plug into after discharge.

19. The audio visual aids were not helpful. They were hard to decifer. Information presented should be more objective and clearly written out. I did not receive literature given out. I need a part-time job in recreational therapy while attending school. Music, camping, dramatics, crafts, outdoor nature activities and other areas.

20. When "everything" is exciting, tremendous, fantastic, one looses focus on what is fact and what is hoped for--this presentation should have taken a whole day or two.

21. I have recently been hired as Program Director/Community Resource Coordinator for a new residential facility for physically disabled young adults. It is a new concept for the Denver area for social rehabilitation for physically handicapped adults. If at all possible, could you send pertinent information on how to implement and get the program off the ground. We are needing new materials for program development.

22. I would like to know what a state hospital could do to help with Public Law 94-142.

23. I would like to have all follow-up materials.

24. What further education would a therapuetic recreationist need to fit into the current movement of adaptive P.E. in the education field? Also, would further education necessarily be manditory. I would like to be kept up to date on movement through correspondence, and would be also willing to pay for the cost of correspondence. I would like information of grants available for the M.R. in the area of creation. Providing facilities and programs for the M.R.

25. It was difficult to understand the significance of the presentation. I felt it did not give details to direct professionals in applying the information to the immediate community.

NAME:	National Recreation and Park Association 1976 Congress for Recreation and Parks	NUMBER ATTENDING:	284
PLACE:	Boston, Massachusetts	NUMBER OF REQUESTS:	180
DATE:	October 19-21, 1976	NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS:	154

The Institute/Session and Materials

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Positive
5 - Very positive
M - Mean score
n - Number evaluating

The CONTENT of this program was:

5 Important ______________ 1 Unimportant

M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
4.5	135	19	0	1/01	10/07	41/30	83/62

The PRESENTATION of this program was:

5 Effective ______________ 1 Ineffective

M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
4.2	142	12	0	5/15	25/18	55/39	57/40

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARK ASSOCIATION

EVALUATION FORM

1976 Congress for Recreation and Parks

Just 60 seconds of your time will help us, and help you. Please evaluate this Educational Program completing the information requested below. Leave this form with the room host or session moderator at the close of the session.

(1,2) Title of Session (Please Print) ______________________________

____

(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM BELOW)

(3) Day	1 SAT	2 SUN	3 MON	4 TUE	5 WED	6 THUR

(4) Time	1 ALL DAY	2 MORNING	3 AFTERNOON

(5) My overall impression of this educational program was:

Excellent 5 4 3 2 1 Poor

(6) The CONTENT of this program was:

Important 5 4 3 2 1 Unimportant

(7) The PRESENTATION of this program was:

Effective 5 4 3 2 1 Ineffective

(8) The PHYSICAL ARRANGEMENTS were:

Satisfactory 5 4 3 2 1 Unsatisfactory

(9) The amount of NEW INFORMATION I learned which will help me professionally is:

Significant 5 4 3 2 1 Insignificant

(10) Should this session be one of the four sessions to be repeated in the "Best of '76" series on Thursday of this week?

Definitely Yes 5 4 3 2 1 Definitely No

(11) NRPA Branch Affiliation (circle one)

1. AFRS	2. APRS	3. NSPR	4. NSRPS
5. NTRS	6. SPRE	7. CBM	8. Non-member

(12) Comments on this Educational Program: ______________________________

____

(13) Comments on other aspects of the Congress: ______________________________

____

NAME: State Institute on Rural Community Recreation for Handicapped Youth

NUMBER ATTENDING: 21

PLACE: Fairfield, Iowa

NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 21

DATE: December 2, 1976

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 17

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Positive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
1. General program format and organization.	4.7	15	2	0		2/13		13/87
2. Presentation by speakers.	4.5	15	2	0		4/27		11/73
3. Opportunities for discussion.	4.5	16	1	0		4/25		12/75
4. Quality of materials that were available.	3.7	12	5	1/08		6/50		5/42
5. Quality of information available.	4.3	14	3	1/07		3/21		10/72
6. Ease of registration.	5.0	5	12	0		0		5/100
7. Lunch and coffee break arrangements.	4.6	14	3	0		3/21		11/79

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: Mid-Atlantic and Caribbean Regional Center for Services to Deaf-Blind Children

NUMBER ATTENDING: 89

PLACE: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 89

DATE: January 11, 1977

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 38

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
1. Lecture by Dr. Nesbitt.	3.5	31	7	0	4/13	10/32	13/42	4/13
2. First Demonstration Group.	4.6	36	2	0	2/06	3/08	4/11	27/75
3. Lecture by Davis and Axelsen.	3.5	38	0	0	3/08	17/45	15/39	3/08
4. Lecture by Bettica.	2.9	38	0	3/07	11/30	17/45	2/05	5/13
5. Second Demonstration Group.	4.0	35	3	1/03	2/06	9/25	5/14	18/51
6. Lecture by Mr. Montanagro.	4.3	38	0	0	1/03	7/18	11/29	19/50

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments and Suggestions from Institute Participants

Regional (NW) Institute on CRH (NRPA)

1. My main reaction is why can't we all accept all "different" people (as we all are) as "persons" instead of "groups", "sexes", etc. I am interested in and greatly in need of any creative, innovative ideas that assist in allowing all persons to enjoy their life to the maximum!

2. Would like information on autism and CP, for programming for these groups. Also would like employment programs for these groups.

3. Junion High program information needed.

4. I am in the process of beginning the field study job at the University of Oregon. I would like to see any materials available on field study at the University level.

5. I coordinate a field study program for the University of Oregon and teach a leadership class. Those materials would be utilized by my students. (materials indicated.)

6. My current needs would be in the area of aquatics.

7. I would like to get some information on using aquatics as a mode of therapy (current trends).

8. Trying to work on staff and community to impress the fact that we must assume the client can move toward normalization regardless of age or disability.

9. Want the information on Recreation for the Handicapped. Thank you.

10. Would like information on work you are doing with the rural service delivery system.

11. Dr. Nesbitt only had 45 minutes. I would like to see information on how special problems were solved.

12. Should have had longer session for Dr. Nesbitt -- one of his own.

13. I am interested in handicapped programs in relation to aquatics in a community recreational facility. I am also interested in special recreation programs for the handicapped, i.e., special events--aquatic or land.

14. Any information regarding aquatic programs for the handicapped would be greatly appreciated. I am currently trying to set up an acquatic handicapped program. Population 50-99, MR.

15. Thank you very much.

16. Please send model of schools.

17. Please send any information in regards to continuing funding for new but established programs. Also anything relevant to a small community. Thank you so much.

18. Leisure time activity information. Funding sources -- Temple University -- Vocational Rehabilitation. (study)

19. I would like the Jr. High model information please.

20. Please send me inforamtion regarding T.R. work with non-handicapped juvenile offenders and emotionally disturbed adolesents. Yisheva University data on leisure education.

21. I am setting up a recreational program forsocial offending youth. I wish to have some guidelines for development within an agency such as this.

22. I greatly appreciate the interest you show in having these materials available for our use. If there are any other available materials in relation to the specialized programs for the physically handicapped, I would greatly ap= preciate your sending them to me. If there is any cost, I would be more than happy to pay for it. Thank you very much for your interest and help.

23. I might briefly mention two issues which are, or will be, of particular concern to municipal parks and recreation programs and personnel: (1) Leisure assessment (where does that handicapped person fit on the dependent-independent continuum) and (2) diminishing municipal services, affecting any new or proposed program.

24. Need information on leisure education curriculum published, that is for TMR or EMR Jr. High - from New. York.

25. Leisure time activity sheet.

26. I want information on leisure time activity curriculum in New York.

27. How to cope with resistence of parents and also one's administrators in working with handicapped; developmental type information for working with CP (phywical); self-help skills - (especially dressing and toilet training) ideas for Down's Syndrom Children.

28. Session was too brief and not suited for a reaction situation. The material (written) presented was excellent.

29. Need leisure time activity curriculum for Jr. High ages.

30. Would like to see Jr. High leisure activity curriculum from Yisheva University.

31. Tri-Cities Washington. Need full time Handicapped Recreation person. But no money to pay for such a position.

32. Please send me name of author and address of curriculum of leisure socialization for Jr. High students.

33. Name and address of leisure services curriculum for Jr. High. Also any information on Adaptive Physical Education programs for all types of disabilities.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: **National Institute on Rural Community Recreation for the Handicapped**
NUMBER ATTENDING: 52

PLACE: **Baton Rouge, Louisiana**
NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 42

DATE: **February 1-2, 1977**
NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 30

The Institute/Session and Materials:
0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	.4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	3.9	30	0	0	0	9/30	14/47	7/23
...guidelines, goals, statements	4.0	27	3	0	0	9/33	10/37	8/30
...printed brochures and materials	4.3	23	7	0	0	3/14	10/43	10/43
...audio-visual materials used	3.9	24	6	0	0	9/37	9/38	6/25
...lectures and presentations	4.2	25	5	0	0	6/24	9/36	10/40
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	4.2	27	3	0	1/ 4	7/26	5/18	14/52
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	4.0	28	2	0	3/11	7/25	6/22	12/42
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	4.0	27	3	0	0	10/37	8/30	9/33
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session facilities	4.0	27	3	0	1/ 4	7/26	10/37	9/33
...institute/session facilities	3.9	28	2	0	1/ 4	6/21	7/25	14/50
...institute/session publicity	3.9	28	2	0	0	10/35	10/36	8/29
...institute/session staff work	4.1	30	0	0	0	8/27	10/33	12/40
...institute/session operation	4.1	28	2	0	0	6/21	14/50	8/29

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments and Suggestions from Institute Participants

National Institute on Rural Community
Recreation for the Handicapped
(Baton Rouge, Louisianna)

1. We need information on implementing a summer program for deaf-blind children from Baton Rouge.
2. There is a great need for recreation in rural areas for all people.
3. I enjoyed the session on recreation and I would like very much to receive more material on handicrafts for the elderly.
4. Need information on organizing a program for the handicapped.
5. Need tips on funding.
6. We need more sessions--up-dated. Need presentations to be slower, more discussion and interaction.
7. Other duties kept me from attending all sessions. However, the workshop was highly informative and very effective. I would like to have some information of this same nature concerning physical education and adapted physical education.
8. Please send information on membership criteria in National Institute.
9. Need more information on recreation for the handicapped.
10. I have a great need to know more about recreation for handicapped in rural areas. I have a need to be more involved.
11. Need organizational materials, paplets, etc. How to motivate community and become involved.
12. Please send information on National Institute new models for community based recreation programs for the handicapped children.
13. I had to attend another class and then to work. But what I heard and understood was interesting and enjoyable.
14. My interest lies in working with the individuals within a hospital setting. I would like to have material relating to opportunities, say working in a Veterans Administration hospital.
15. The session was very interesting and enabled me to find out new ideas. I think people should realize the necessity and importance of therpeutic recreation for mentally disturbed, aged, blind, deaf, and all handicapped and able-bodied people.

Baton Rouge Institute Comments cont...

16. Institute was very accurate and interesting. I will need a full-time job in Therapeutic Recreation for summer 1977 and would like information or brochures on well-organized Therapeutic Recreation programs and facilities for the handicapped and exceptional children.

17. Parks and the handicapped would be one area on which I would like information. As a whole, the workshop was very enlightening and enjoyable.

18. I anticipate Dr. Nesbitt's program and I will be working out mutually beneficial arrangements for model development in Arkansas.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: **Regional (Central) In-Service Training Session on CRH (NRPA)**
NUMBER ATTENDING: 50

PLACE: **Rock Island, Illinois**
NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 50

DATE: **March 25, 1977**
NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 15

The Institute/Session and Materials:
0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	2.9	14	1	2/14	1/07	7/50	4/29	0
...guidelines, goals, statements	3.1	15	0	2/13	0	8/54	5/33	0
...printed brochures and materials	3.0	11	4	1/18	0	4/37	5/45	0
...audio-visual materials used	3.1	13	2	1/8	4/30	2/15	5/39	1/8
...lectures and presentations	3.1	14	1	2/14	1/8	5/35	6/43	0
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	3.5	11	4	0	2/18	2/18	7/64	0
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	3.3	12	3	0	3/25	3/25	6/50	0
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	3.2	10	5	0	3/30	3/30	3/30	1/10
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	3.2	9	6	0	1/11	5/55	3/33	0
...institute/session facilities	2.9	8	7	0	2/25	5/63	1/13	0
...institute/session publicity	2.9	8	7	0	2/25	5/63	1/13	0
...institute/session staff work	3.0	8	7	0	2/25	4/49	2/25	0
...institute/session operation	2.9	8	7	1/13	1/13	4/50	2/25	0

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments and Suggestions from Institute Participants

Regional (Central) In-Service Training
Session on CRH (NRPA)

1. Condense Group III Session. Break into smaller discussion groups earlier.
2. Appropriate to needs; exceptional educational value. It was expertly presented.
3. Not interested in the material.
4. Good to know the service is an available resource. I will give some thought as to how to best avail ourselves of the service.
5. As a student in therapeutic recreation, I would appreciate any information you may have on mental disabilities.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: National In-Service Training Session On CRH (AAHPER)
NUMBER ATTENDING: 90

PLACE: Seattle, Washington
NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 40

DATE: March 24, 1977
NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 11

The Institute/Session and Materials:
0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	4.1	9	2	0	0	2/23	4/44	3/33
...guidelines, goals, statements	3.9	10	1	0	0	4/40	3/30	3/30
...printed brochures and materials	4.6	10	1	0	0	0	4/40	6/60
...audio-visual materials used	4.5	10	1	0	0	0	5/50	5/50
...lectures and presentations	4.2	11	0	0	0	2/18	5/46	4/36
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	4.1	9	2	0	1/11	1/11	3/34	4/44
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	3.9	9	2	1/11	0	2/23	2/23	4/44
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	3.9	9	2	0	1/11	3/34	1/11	4/44
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	4.3	8	3	0	1/12	1/12	1/12	5/64
...institute/session facilities	4.3	10	1	0	0	2/20	3/30	5/50
...institute/session publicity	3.8	8	3	0	1/12	1/12	5/62	1/14
...institute/session staff work	4.5	8	3	0	0	0	4/50	4/50
...institute/session operation	4.5	8	3	0	0	0	4/50	4/50

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments and Suggestions from Institute Participants

National In-Service Training Session On CRH (AAHPER)

1. I need materials in all areas for professional preparation in adapted PE and Therapeutic Recreation.

2. John, your summary was interesting.

3. Ideals for in-service training, utilizing community activities, program to integrate in.

4. I had a background of several previous workshops which helped a great deal. I missed Louise Priest's time in water, but realize time with younsters was limited. People should keep name tags on the whole workshop. I need more access to professional information. I am not in AAHPER.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME:	Regional (Southern) Institute on CRH (NRPA)	NUMBER ATTENDING: (64) + (52) + (33) + (22) + (18)	189
PLACE:	Savannah, Georgia	NUMBER OF REQUESTS:	43
DATE:	April 4, 1977	NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS:	21

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	4.1	13	8	0	0	2/15	8/62	3/23
...guidelines, goals, statements	4.0	17	4	0	0	4/24	9/52	4/24
...printed brochures and materials	4.2	16	5	0	0	2/12	8/50	6/39
...audio-visual materials used	4.0	9	11	0	0	3/34	3/33	3/33
...lectures and presentations	3.7	14	7	0	0	1/07	10/72	3/21
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	4.3	18	3	0	1/06	2/11	5/27	10/56
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	4.4	18	3	0	0	3/17	5/27	10/56
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	4.2	16	5	0	1/06	3/19	4/25	8/50
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	4.1	11	10	0	2/19	2/18	3/27	4/36
...institute/session facilities	3.9	16	5	0	1/06	4/25	6/38	5/31
...institute/session publicity	3.8	17	4	0	1/06	7/41	7/41	2/12
...institute/session staff work	4.0	15	6	0	1/07	2/13	9/60	3/20
...institute/session operation	4.2	16	5	0	2/12	3/19	8/50	3/19

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments and Suggestions from Institute Participants

Regional (Southern) Institute on
CRH (NRPA)

1. I need information dealing with starting a T.R. program in the community setting -- financing, transportation, etc.
2. I am interested in a job in Community Therapeutic Recreation -- graduate August 1977 - Masters; I want a copy of the Savannah paper.
3. I need information on camping programs for the multiply-handicapped and mentally retarded.
4. Transportation of handicapped as we move into a county-wide program information needed.
5. I need program ideas on aging -- for use in nursing homes.
6. Recreation in the Total Rehabilitation Process. Reserach funding available information needed.
7. In January 1977, we started with a budget of $0.00. In July we will have funds.
8. Please send me any information on those who are shut-in and cannot attend broader community programs. Also, we need programs on the physically and mentally handicapped. Also sports for the handicapped (Program Models).
9. Very informative. I need information on goals and objectives. This was well balanced.
10. Any information on Therapuetic Recreation for shut-ins in the community and general information on community recreation for the physically handicapped.
11. Planning a one-day wheel chair sports program. Any information will be appreciated. Not enought time in the one-hour period to ask questions, respond to presentations, etc.
12. Interested in materials on wheel chair sports.
13. Need inforamtion on Day Camp Programs for the educable mentally retarded and physically handicapped. Also need information on swimming programs for these groups.
14. Very, very interesting from an administrative frame of thought. The circle of chairs was an old, but not used often enough trick. It worked because many ideas were great.

Savannah Institute Comments cont...

15. I am heading up the Therapeutic Recreation Emphasis area in our Department and teaching all T.R. and special populations classes. I need any information that would benefit my students' needs and interests and also information that would help indoctrinate me into the field of Therapuetic Recreation. (My background is adapted physical education.)

16. The problem with success is based on numbers; liability; accountability - pre and post assessment; transportation.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: Regional (MW) Special Program on Physical Education and REcreation for the Handicapped (CDAAHPER), 5 Sessions

PLACE: Cheyenne, Wyoming

DATE: April 13-16, 1977

NUMBER ATTENDING: 126
(55) + (30) + (14) + (15) + (12)

NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 57
(25) + (15) + (8) + (8) + (12) 27

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS:
(8) + (9) + (3) + (7) + (0)

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models								
...guidelines, goals, statements								
...printed brochures and materials								
...audio-visual materials used								
...lectures and presentations								
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations								
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants								
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact								
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives								
...institute/session facilities								
...institute/session publicity								
...institute/session staff work								
...institute/session operation								

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: **Recreation and Recreation for Handicapped, #1**
PLACE: **Cheyenne, Wyoming**
DATE: **April 13, 1977**

NUMBER ATTENDING: 55
NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 25
NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 8

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	3.4	5	3	0	0	3/60	2/40	0
...guidelines, goals, statements	3.8	6	2	0	0	1/17	5/83	0
...printed brochures and materials	3.0	5	3	0	0	1/20	2/40	2/40
...audio-visual materials used	3.3	4	4	0	1/25	2/40	0	1/25
...lectures and presentations	4.0	5	3	0	0	1/20	3/60	1/20
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	4.5	6	2	0	0	1/14	1/17	4/67
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	4.5	6	2	0	0	0	3/50	3/50
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	4.7	6	2	0	0	0	2/33	4/67
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	4.0	6	2	0	0	2/33	4/67	0
...institute/session facilities	3.7	7	1	0	0	3/43	3/43	1/14
...institute/session publicity	3.6	7	1	0	1/14	2/29	3/43	1/14
...institute/session staff work	4.3	7	1	0	0	1/14	3/43	3/43
...institute/session operation	4.0	6	0	0	0	2/33	2/34	2/33

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments and Suggestions from Institute Participants

1. Need for more practical materials in order to take back and implement into P.E. programs.
2. Methods of instructing life-time sports to large groups would be helpful.
3. Need for information on programs for developmentally disabled adults for a private organization -- leisure-time activities and recreation activities.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: Community Recreation for Handicapped and Special Olympics, #2
NUMBER ATTENDING: 30

PLACE: Cheyenne, Wyoming
NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 15

DATE: April 13-16, 1977
NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 9

The Institute/Session and Materials:
0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	3.5	9	0	0	0	5/55	3/34	1/11
...guidelines, goals, statements	3.8	8	1	0	0	2/25	4/50	2/25
...printed brochures and materials	3.5	6	3	0	2/33	0	3/50	1/17
...audio-visual materials used	4.0	7	2	0	0	1/14	5/71	1/15
...lectures and presentations	4.1	8	1	0	0	1/22	5/63	2/25
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	4.3	8	1	0	0	0	6/75	2/25
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	4.1	8	1	0	0	1/22	5/63	2/25
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	4.3	8	1	0	0	0	6/75	2/25
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	4.3	7	2	0	0	0	5/71	2/29
...institute/session facilities	3.9	8	1	0	0	2/25	5/63	1/22
...institute/session publicity	4.3	7	1	0	1/14	1/14	4/58	1/14
...institute/session staff work	3.6	7	1	0	0	1/14	4/58	2/28
...institute/session operation	4.3	6	2	0	0	0	4/67	2/33

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments and Suggestions from Institute Participants

Special Olympics (Cheyenne, Wyoming)

1. Very interesting and valuable.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: Physical Education and Public Law 94-142 - A Local Perspective, #3
NUMBER ATTENDING: 14

PLACE: **Cheyenne, Wyoming**
NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 8

DATE: **April 13-16, 1977**
NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 3

The Institute/Session and Materials:
0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	3.0	3	0	0	0	3/100	0	0
...guidelines, goals, statements	4.0	2	1	0	0	0	2/100	0
...printed brochures and materials	3.7	3	0	0	0	1/33	2/67	0
...audio-visual materials used	3.0	2	1	0	1/50	0	1/50	0
...lectures and presentations	3.3	3	0	0	0	2/75	1/25	0
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	4.0	2	1	0	0	0	2/100	0
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	3.5	2	1	0	0	1/50	1/50	0
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	3.5	2	1	0	0	1/50	1/50	0
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	4.0	2	1	0	0	0	2/100	0
...institute/session facilities	3.5	2	1	0	0	1/50	1/50	0
...institute/session publicity	4.0	2	1	0	0	0	2/100	0
...institute/session staff work	4.0	2	1	0	0	0	2/100	0
...institute/session operation	4.0	2	1	0	0	0	2/100	0

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: **Physical Education and Public Law 94-142 A National Perspective, #4** NUMBER ATTENDING: 15

PLACE: **Cheyenne, Wyoming** NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 8

DATE: **April 13-16, 1977** NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 7

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	4.8	4	3	0	0	0	1/25	3/75
...guidelines, goals, statements	4.3	3	4	0	0	0	2/67	1/33
...printed brochures and materials	5.0	2	5	0	0	0	0	2/100
...audio-visual materials used	4.5	6	1	0	0	0	3/50	3/50
...lectures and presentations	4.5	6	1	0	0	0	3/50	3/50
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	5.0	5	2	0	0	0	0	5/100
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	4.5	7	0	0	0	0	3/43	4/57
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	3.5	5	2	0	0	1/20	2/40	2/40
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	4.0	3	4	0	0	1/33	0	2/67
...institute/session facilities	4.5	2	5	0	0	0	1/50	1/50
...institute/session publicity	4.0	2	5	0	0	1/50	0	1/50
...institute/session staff work	4.5	2	5	0	0	0	1/50	1/50
...institute/session operation	4.5	2	5	0	0	0	1/50	1/50

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments and Suggestions from Institute Participants

Physical Education and Public Law 94-142 -- A National Perspective

1. Very good.

2. I am very interested in the implementation of IEP and would like to get involved in designing programs for the handicapped. Do you have any information as to positions at the local, state or federal level that are available for any involvement?

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: Aquatics for Handicapped, #5 NUMBER ATTENDING: 12

PLACE: Cheyenne, Wyoming NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 12

DATE: April 13-16, 1978 NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 0

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models								
...guidelines, goals, statements								
...printed brochures and materials								
...audio-visual materials used								
...lectures and presentations								
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations								
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants								
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact								
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives								
...institute/session facilities								
...institute/session publicity								
...institute/session staff work								
...institute/session operation								

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: Regional (NE) Institute on CRH (NRPA)	NUMBER ATTENDING: 274 (128) + (86) + (60)
PLACE: Hyannis, Massachusetts	NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 84 (48) + (26) + (10)
DATE: April 18, 1977	NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 61 (26) + (19) + (3 + 13)

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models								
...guidelines, goals, statements								
...printed brochures and materials								
...audio-visual materials used								
...lectures and presentations								
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations								
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants								
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact								
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives								
...institute/session facilities								
...institute/session publicity								
...institute/session staff work								
...institute/session operation								

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: **Regional (NE) Institute on CRH (NRPA) Session #1**

NUMBER ATTENDING: 128

PLACE: **Hyannis, Massachusetts**

NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 48

DATE: **April 18, 1977**

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 26

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	3.2	24	2	0	1/04	16/67	7/29	0
...guidelines, goals, statements	3.3	24	2	0	3/13	12/50	7/27	2/08
...printed brochures and materials	3.8	21	5	1/04	0	6/29	8/38	6/29
...audio-visual materials used	3.0	11	15	1/09	1/09	6/55	3/27	0
...lectures and presentations	3.2	21	5	0	4/20	9/43	7/33	1/04
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	3.4	22	4	1/05	4/18	8/36	7/32	2/09
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	3.2	19	7	0	5/26	9/48	2/10	3/16
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	3.2	19	7	0	4/21	8/42	7/37	0
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	3.8	15	11	1/06	0	4/27	6/40	4/27
...institute/session facilities	3.4	20	6	2/10	0	8/40	8/40	2/10
...institute/session publicity	3.3	17	9	1/06	0	8/47	8/47	0
...institute/session staff work	3.5	18	8	1/06	1/06	5/27	10/55	1/06
...institute/session operation	3.4	18	8	1/06	1/06	7/38	7/38	2/12

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments and Suggestions by Institute Participants

Regional (NE) Insitute on CRH (NRPA)

1. In having none of the printed material program lost much of its value to me Susan Deak was terrific. We need more dynamic people like her.

2. With limited amount of time and having a large group, it is impossible to have everyone tell who they are although this is a good technique for small groups. The handouts are helpful.

3. Lacked specific direction. Not a bad general overview.

4. First of main speakers were fair. The last speaker was moderate -- gave "gut" reactions and information explaining problem casues. Gave means to solve problems of current results.

5. Need specific programs where handicapped and able-bodied are completely integrated.

6. Integration of MR (trainable) adults into the community.

7. Comments by speakers on experiences and situations was most helpful and interesting; particular problems faced by individuals is important.

8. First part of session asking people where and what is a waste of time.

9. Much time was wasted initially in the individual programs.

10. I would like to have information on Rehabilitation Services, counselings, programs for physical, mental and/or aged handicapps. Please.. this presentation was good and all the speakers were very enthusiastic and inspirational. I would prefer any information to be sent to my home address. Thanks!

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME:	**Regional (NE) Institute on CRH (NRPA) Session #2**	NUMBER ATTENDING:	86
PLACE:	**Hyannis, Massachusetts**	NUMBER OF REQUESTS:	26
DATE:	**April 18, 1977**	NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS:	19

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	3.7	15	4	0	0	5/33	9/60	1/07
...guidelines, goals, statements	4.1	15	4	0	0	3/20	8/53	4/27
...printed brochures and materials	3.3	10	9	0	3/40	2/20	4/40	1/10
...audio-visual materials used	2.9	8	11	0	2/25	5/62	1/13	0
...lectures and presentations	3.9	16	3	0	1/06	3/19	9/56	3/19
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	3.9	16	3	0	0	5/31	8/50	3/19
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	3.5	16	3	0	0	9/56	6/38	1/06
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	3.6	17	2	0	0	8/47	7/41	2/12
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	3.9	10	9	0	1/10	0	8/80	1/10
...institute/session facilities	3.6	15	4	0	2/14	5/33	5/33	3/20
...institute/session publicity	3.5	14	5	0	0	8/57	5/36	1/07
...institute/session staff work	3.9	15	4	0	1/07	3/20	7/46	4/27
...institute/session operation	3.7	15	4	0	2/13	3/20	7/47	3/20

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments and Suggestions from Institute Participants

Regional (NE) Institute on CRH (NRPA)

1. Haven't attended long enough to really judge.

2. Very helpful on current needs and interests. I am also involved with elderly housing in the community sponsored by church and community as a member of Building and Planning Boards, Inc. Recreation programming for these people. Interested in TR in Home Care Program. Need is there, but funding needs to be developed which will happen by "selling" the concept.

3. First job dealing with recreation and I am in a state institution working mainly with geriatrics with numberable illnesses. What is available in this area for "intelligent" new ideas?

4. Comments about how to join other than just NRPA membership, the united movement Mr. John Davis spoke of this morning. How to effectively deal with the problem of promoting handicapped recreation and recreational therapy as viable professions. BE SPECIFIC! Need more time for individual presentations.

5. I am setting up a Leisure Counsling Program and I am experiencing barriers in utilizing community facilities in reintegrating my population rank into their communities. I am beginning to focus more on teaching the skills necessary to get to activity areas.

6. A final schedule could have been mailed before the conference began.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME:	**Regional (NE) Institute on CRH (NRPA)** **Session #3**	NUMBER ATTENDING:	60
PLACE:	**Hyannis, Massachusetts**	NUMBER OF REQUESTS:	10
DATE:	**April 18, 1977**	NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS:	3 (13)

The Institute/Session and Materials:

- 0 - No response/omit
- 1 - Very negative
- 2 - Negative
- M - Mean score
- 3 - Satisfactory
- 4 - Postive
- 5 - Very positive
- n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	4.0	2	1	0	0	1/50	0	1/50
...guidelines, goals, statements	4.5	2	1	0	0	0	1/50	1/50
...printed brochures and materials	4.0	2	1	0	0	1/50	0	1/50
...audio-visual materials used	5.0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1/100
...lectures and presentations	4.5	2	1	0	0	0	1/50	1/50
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	5.0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1/100
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	3.0	1	2	0	0	1/100	0	0
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	3.0	1	2	0	0	1/100	0	0
Institute/Session Organization	3.0	1	2	0	0	1/100	0	0
My understanding of the institute/session objectives								
...institute/session facilities	2.0	2	1	1/50	0	1/50	0	0
...inst[illegible]/session publicity	3.3	3	0	0	0	2/75	1/25	0
...institute/session staff work	3.5	2	1	0	0	1/50	1/50	0
...institute/session operation	3.5	2	1	0	0	1/50	1/50	0

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME:	**Financing Recreation Service Programs Local Evaluations , #3**	NUMBER ATTENDING:	60
PLACE:	**Hyannis, Massachusetts**	NUMBER OF REQUESTS:	10
DATE:	**April 18, 1977**	NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS:	13 (3)

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
1. **My overall impression of the program was...**	3.8	12	1	0		3/25	8/67	1/08
2. **Advance preparation of the speakers appeared to be...**	4.0	12	1	0		3/25	6/50	3/25
3. **The content of the program was...**	4.1	12	1	0		3/25	5/42	4/33
4. **Presentations by the speakers were...**	4.2	12	1	0		1/08	8/67	3/25
5. **The room and physical arrangements were...**	3.7	13	0	1/08		2/15	9/69	1/08

***Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evalution on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.**

General Comments and Suggestions from Institute Participants

Regional (NE) Institute on CRH (NRPA)

1. Please send me a copy of the pink handout used for explaining Public Law 94-142.

2. Rushed, but good opportunity.

3. Don't feel I can complete evaluation for the segment that I attended because I feel it was poorly identified. It was more on resources than actual funding. The leaders were extremely rapid speakers and assumed that all present had attended early sessions, thereby ignoring those of us who came to widen our understanding of a new area.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: **Regional (NW) Institute on CRH (NRPA)**

PLACE: **Eugene, Oregon**

DATE: **May 2, 1977**

NUMBER ATTENDING: 201
(127) + (74)

NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 61

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 60
(53) + (7)

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	3.9	52	11	0	1/02	15/29	23/44	13/25
...guidelines, goals, statements	4.1	51	12	0	0	10/20	23/45	18/35
...printed brochures and materials	4.5	53	10	0	0	5/10	16/30	32/60
...audio-visual materials used	4.3	29	34	0	1/03	5/18	8/26	15/53
...lectures and presentations	4.3	52	11	0	0	9/11	19/37	24/46
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	4.2	48	15	0	0	5/10	25/52	18/38
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	3.9	48	15	0	0	19/40	17/35	12/25
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	4.5	41	22	0	0	13/32	18/44	10/24
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	3.9	38	25	1/03	0	8/21	21/55	8/21
...institute/session facilities	3.8	42	21	0	4/10	9/21	19/45	10/24
...institute/session publicity	3.8	41	22	1/03	2/04	9/22	20/49	9/22
...institute/session staff work	4.3	38	25	0	0	5/13	17/45	16/42
...institute/session operation	4.2	38	25	0	0	5/13	19/50	14/37

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: **Regional (NW) Institute on CRH (NRPA)**
Local Evaluations

NUMBER ATTENDING:

PLACE: **Eugene, Oregon**

NUMBER OF REQUESTS:

DATE: **May 2, 1977**

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 7

The Institute/Session and Materials:
0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

	M*	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
1. **My overall impression of the program was...**	3.6	7	0	0		1/14	2/28	4/58
2. **The content of the program was ...**	4.3	7	0	0		2/28	1/14	4/58
3. **Presentations by the speakers were...**	4.9	7	0	0		0	1/14	6/86
4. **The room and physical arrangements were...**	4.3	7	0	0		1/14	3/43	3/43

***Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of theevaluations made on each item.**

General Comments and Suggestions from Institute Participants

Regional (NW) Institute on CRH (NRPA)
Eugene, Oregon
Local Comments

1. This was the most informative conference.
2. We needed more time.
3. The name tags showed students versus professionals.
4. We need more examples of funding.
5. We needed more on small communities.
6. We need to learn outcome of problems-solutions.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: Session on Recreation and Leisure at Annual Meeting U.S. President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped (CRL-PCEH)
NUMBER ATTENDING: 115

PLACE: Washington, D.C.
NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 61

DATE: May 4, 1977
NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 37

The Institute/Session and Materials:
0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	3.5	23	14	1/04	4/18	6/26	5/22	7/30
...guidelines, goals, statements	3.9	31	6	1/03	2/06	7/23	10/32	11/36
...printed brochures and materials	3.3	27	10	1/01	1/01	11/40	6/22	8/30
...audio-visual materials used	3.6	13	24	0	2/16	5/38	2/15	4/31
...lectures and presentations	3.7	31	6	1/03	3/10	6/19	12/39	9/29
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	3.9	31	6	1/05	2/06	8/25	8/25	12/39
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	3.3	26	11	3/11	3/11	9/36	5/19	6/23
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	3.1	23	14	4/17	2/10	9/39	4/17	4/17
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	3.7	20	17	1/05	1/50	5/25	9/45	4/20
...institute/session facilities	3.4	25	12	2/08	1/04	11/44	7/28	4/16
...institute/session publicity	3.0	21	16	2/09	4/19	8/38	6/28	1/05
...institute/session staff work	2.8	22	15	0	2/09	10/45	5/23	5/23
...institute/session operation	3.7	21	16	0	1/05	10/47	5/24	5/24

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments and Suggestions from Institute Participants

Session on Recreation and Leisure at
Annual Meeting U.S. President's Committee on
Employment of the Handicapped (CRL-PCEH)

Washington, D.C.

1. Harold Snyder's speech was very good.

2. Information on parks - new ones to be in the future and possibility of using present ones to better or more constructive use. Also statistics on number of handicapped employed by Federal Government.

3. I would like information about jobs in the area of recreational programs for handicapped persons.

4. Very interested in employment and recreation in general. Would welcome any information.

5. I would like to be kept informed regarding all information so I can pass this information on to my students, the library, and the community at hand.

6. Please put me on your mailing list for Recreation and Leisure Newsletter from PCEH.

7. Please send me the brief and data that the President's Committee has on recreation, elisure, and employment participation.

8. Please send me the brief and data on recreation and employment the President's Committee has with regards to leisure, recreation, etc.

9. Types of leisure and recreation -- wheelchairs; types of travel - wheelchair.

10. Need more specifics as to types of recreation involved. Quotes and figures of no value.

11. Need a little better barrier removal to get to meetings. Very difficult to maneuver curbs between here and Holiday Inn when confined to a wheelchair.

12. More large department stores and corporations to be approached regarding employment of handicapped. Explain positively workmen's compensation as related to the handicapped.

13. I would like a copy of your study (Dr. Compton) in advance of the published copy. I am beginning a study in a matter of weeks myself.

14. Funding in recreation areas as related to the severely and profoundly handicapped and college and universities (junior and senior)

Washington, D.C. Comments Cont...

15. More information on leadership role of handicapped individuals - leaders are trained, not born. Professional study to train the handicapped to become professional park and recreation leaders, parks and recreation jobs, etc.

16. Harold Snyder was one of the highpoints of the conference!

17. I only could stay to hear Harold Snyder - with Smithsonian Institute speak.

18. Harold Snyder was terrific. His points should be the mainstay of this whole conference instead of being regarded as the radical fringe.

19. What role can handicapped have in mainstreaming: What type of cultural activities are handicapped best at? Is it important to teach how to adapt recreation for the handicapped? Can handicapped teach and coach recreation activities? How can recreation department with limited budgets develop programs without money?

20. One service provided by my Agency (N.H. Association for the Blind) is a statewide recreation and volunteer program for all ages of blind and visually handicapped. My interest is primarily in recreation programs designed to benefit the handicapped rather than employment of the handicapped in the recreation industry.

21. Please send me the statistics on employment of the handicapped in leisure services. I need them in order to disseminate information to the Illinois delegation to the White House Conference.

22. Why was the profession of Rehabilitation Counseling not included under "Profession" when they are one of the most helping professions of the handicapped.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: **Regional (Mid-east) Special Institute on CRH**

PLACE: **Carrollton, Maryland**

DATE: **May 12, 1977**

NUMBER ATTENDING: 86
(43 + 18) + (25)

NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 53
(17 + 18) + (18)

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 50
(15 + 17) + (18)

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models								
...guidelines, goals, statements								
...printed brochures and materials								
...audio-visual materials used								
...lectures and presentations								
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations								
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants								
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact								
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives								
...institute/session facilities								
...institute/session publicity								
...institute/session staff work								
...institute/session operation								

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: Regional (Mid-east) Special Institute on CRH, #1 (Eval. A)
NUMBER ATTENDING: 61

PLACE: Carrollton, Maryland
NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 35

DATE: May 12, 1977
NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 32 (15)

The Institute/Session and Materials:
0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	3.7	11	4	0	0	4/36	6/55	1/09
...guidelines, goals, statements	3.8	13	2	0	0	5/38	6/46	2/15
...printed brochures and materials	4.0	12	3	0	0	4/33	4/34	4/33
...audio-visual materials used	3.8	8	7	0	0	3/38	4/50	1/12
...lectures and presentations	3.7	13	2	0	0	4/31	9/69	0
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	4.1	14	3	0	1/07	2/14	6/43	5/38
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	3.5	15	2	1/07	1/07	5/33	5/33	3/20
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	3.8	13	2	0	0	7/54	2/15	4/31
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	3.5	8	7	0	0	5/63	2/25	1/13
...institute/session facilities	3.3	12	5	2/17	1/08	3/25	4/33	2/17
...institute/session publicity	3.5	9	6	0	1/11	3/33	4/44	1/11
...institute/session staff work	3.8	10	5	0	0	4/40	4/40	2/20
...institute/session operation	3.9	9	6	0	0	3/53	4/44	2/23

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments and Suggestions ffom Institute Participants

Regional (Mid-east) Special Institute
Carrollton, Maryland

1. I am planning to move to Arostook City, Maine, and would very much like to start a program of this type in the greater metropolitan area. I would appreciate any information you cangive me about whom I should contact for a grant application and money.

2. I would also appreciate information about instigating a private, non-profit organization. My program is unique, incorporates social, medical, and the recreation and vocational aspects. Would be glad to give you information on it.

3. Delaware State Parks and Recreation had programs in three state parks last year for special populations. It now has a state-wide organization called CLASP whose major emphasis is to reduce barriers, coordinate activities, and eliminate overlapping of services.

4. I need information regarding development of services in rural areas with community agencies that are very slow, cautious, and seemingly without money.

5. Community projects for adults with hearing impairments. I am a student at George Washington University, physical education major interest in therapeutic recreation. I need information on job placements or training programs having to do with Therapeutic Recreation in the Washington, D.C. areas.

6. The session room was noisy and had narrow access inside for handicapped.

7. I am interested in adaptive physical education, therapuetic recreation, job opportunitites, and municipal community recreation. Send me everything concerning therapuetic recreation.

8. I need information on obtaining Therapeutic Recreation Grants, Public Law 94-142, and attitudinal and architectural barriers.

9. In a community with no current programs for the handicapped, how do you motivate them to initiate such programs? What would the community look for in return, especially from institutions for the handicapped in their area?

10. In process of trying for a handicapped program for all ages, all handicaps and conditions. Can use your help, especially pertaining to outdoor facility use.

11. Facility use at Mt. Wood Park.

12. I am interested in community programming, the handicapped and the procedures involved.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: Regional (Mid-east) Special Institute on CRH, #1 (Eval. B)
NUMBER ATTENDING: 18

PLACE: Carrollton, Maryland
NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 18

DATE: May 12, 1977
NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 32 (17)

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
1. Quality of Content:	4.3	16	1	0	0	2/22	7/44	7/44
2. Presentation of Material:	4.2	15	2	0	0	2/13	7/47	6/40
3. The amount of information I learned which will help me professionally:	3.8	16	1	0	0	7/44	6/37	3/11
4. Time allotted for session:	2.8	17	0	3/18	4/23	5/29	3/18	2/12
5. The session was what I expected it to be according to program description:	4.1	17	0	0	0	4/23	7/41	6/35

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments and Suggestions from Institute Participants

Regional (Mid-east) Special Institute On CRH

Carrollton, Maryland

1. Very good program.
2. Would like more data.
3. Room distractions were excessive. We need session on condituation with other
4. Setting by virtue of national visitor left a lot to be desired.
5. Rather than describe facilities and programs they should have given us guidelines on how we can start a Vicki Annaud offered most information.
6. Too noisy in lounge. Should disallow
7. Too much noise in here.
8. Need more diversity; not just urban areas, but also rural areas.
9. Really enjoyed it, especially the moderator's pulling it together.
10. Too much outside noise.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME:	Regional (Mid-east) Special Institute on CRH, #2	NUMBER ATTENDING:	25
PLACE:	Carrollton, Maryland	NUMBER OF REQUESTS:	18
DATE:	May 12, 1977	NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS:	18

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
1. Quality of Content:	3.9	15	3	0	0	2/13	10/67	3/20
2. Presentation of Material:	4.1	15	3	0	1/07	2/13	6/40	6/40
3. The amount of information I learned which will help me professionally:	3.8	18	0	0	1/06	4/22	11/61	2/11
4. Time allotted for session:	3.5	17	1	0	3/18	5/29	6/35	3/45
5. The session was what I expected it to be according to program description.	3.4	16	2	1/06	1/06	7/44	5/31	2/13

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Suggestions and Comments from Institute Participants

Regional (Mid-east) Special Institute
Carrollton, Maryland

1. Much too early for fair evaluation--just arrived at 3:00 p.m.

2. Such a wide range and large amount of information. I am over whelmed by the number of organizations and ways of making headway. Could use addresses, written material and time.

3. N.J. Training Project. Please send information.

4. You gave us more work to do than answers. We have an intern program about 20 students. We need to give them career counseling, etc. We are also expanding our recreation program. Need more knowledge. We could assist by acquainting other professional with developmental disabilities in general. Need more reference points.

5. Need more information on New Jersey Local Training Project. Also need information on ways of receiving funding for in-service training and on Public Law 94-142.

6. More information concerning activity program training, i.e., 36 hour course and 75 hour course. Courses relevant to program.

7. New Jersey Training Project--we need information on this.

8. Would like New Jersey Local Training Project information. Too much time spent on education of TR specialist; too little on practical problems of informal education resources available, etc.

9. Too much lecture, too little interchange among participatns. Not geared enough to practical community problems.

"Implementing the Recreation Dimension of P.L. 94-142"

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: **Workshop on Recreation and Public Law 94-142, Sponsored by the Colorado Therapeutic Recreation Society**

PLACE: **National Jewish Hospital.**
Denver, Colorado

DATE: **December 9, 1977**

NUMBER ATTENDING: 125

NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 65

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 56

The Institute/Session and Materials:

0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	3.7	41	4	1/2	1/2	14/34	17/42	8/20
...guidelines, goals, statements	3.8	44	4	0	1/3	15/34	20/45	8/18
...printed brochures and materials	4.6	49	0	0	0	3/6	12/25	34/69
...audio-visual materials used	3.5	47	0	1/2	4/9	21/42	15/32	7/15
...lectures and presentations	3.7	50	0	1/2	3/6	14/28	24/48	8/16
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	3.9	56	0	0	2/4	13/23	27/48	14/25
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	3.0	52	0	1/2	2/3	23/44	25/48	2/3
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	3.6	54	2	0	1/2	27/50	21/38	5/10
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	4.1	48	0	0	2/4	12/25	19/40	15/31
...institute/session facilities	4.0	53	0	1/2	1/2	14/26	18/34	19/36
...institute/session publicity	3.8	55	0	3/6	9/16	15/27	20/36	8/15
...institute/session staff work	3.9	50	3	0	1/2	11/22	25/50	12/25
...institute/session operation	3.9	49	3	0	1/3	15/30	22/45	11/22

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments

Denver, December 9, 1977

1. I need information about private school aid, and aid to State institutions. (If information has been gathered)

2. I know "0" about the area. Any information is good in-sight for me.

3. Overwhelming!

4. Very informative--excellent!

5. My question is: after 18 years of these benefits (3-21) where does the individual go then -- are we simply dropping them out of the picture?

6. I am not aware of what the abbreviations everyone was using meant.

7. I am interested in job opportunities in this area.

8. The basic information as provided to day should be taken to more local school districts, PTA's, supportive community and school services, as well as Park and Recreation Departments. School magazines, state newsletters (as CPRS Skyline), Municipal league magazine, etc., including newspaper features are good publicity services. Public and professional administration support I sure would be gained!

9. I think it's important to keep all these good folks that are interested informed and on top of what is happening.

10. The educational process is only the beginning

11. I am from Missouri - so could you please send me literature as to the status of P.L. 94-142 in Missouri.

12. I have many questions regarding governmental funding for related fields such as dance therapy. Presently, I am being paid by the parents of my handicapped students (First Greek School). My program is an extracurricular activity, rather than an integral part of their total educational plan.

    The recognition of dance as a therapeutic tool should also be included in the total scheme of recreation therapeutics and special education. CD/MTA is a young organization and therefore needs the support of people like you. Who should we contact for further questioning?

    We, as an organization, wish to promote the awareness, acceptance and use of dance therapy and the arts. I feel our goals and interests go hand-in-hand with yours and for a long time have worked by your side. How can we further help each other?

13. How can P.L. 94-142 help a TR specialist sell a recreation program to the schools for their handicapped students if its is not required?

14. To much material to try to absorb in such a short time. Would it be possible to have the material ahead of time or not to try to cover as much at once.

15. Potential availability of funding at federal level was covered well. Needed more information on state plan (will be available I suppose once final action is taken on plan) and its implications for recreation professionals in the many delivery systems.

    I believe the majority of the participants from the community recreation sector were interested in learning how the law affects them both directly and indirectly, and although the monography explains the potential at the federal level, we really didn't learn the implications in our own state.

16. I wish I could have stayed. Please send me any and all information pertaining to this law with special interests in Leisure Counseling and Public Schools contracting for our services.

17. Workshop needed practice run on film strip. The first speaker wasn't well versed in the area. Dr. Nesbitt probably should have spoken first.

    Would have liked to see more on local level -- problem: most community recreation departments don't have a TR specialist or time to serve on staffing team. There doesn't seem to be much legal or wanted cooperation between schools and recreation departments.

18. What about recreation for adults who are working in the community, workshops or not working at all--recreation therapy at the developmental disability state funding level has been excluded in the priority for funding.

    Mentally retarded adults really need recreation and the city recreation departments are not fulfilling these needs.

19. Would like further information on in-service training sessions for future RT's in the evaluation and assessment.

20. More clarification is needed on what and how state and Federal guidelines differ -- Bill 94-142 mediator needed to decide on certification for TR qualifications, etc.

21. It appears very little of this law applies to our type of recreation.

22. I would like to see more public awareness in communities for needs and numbers of special populations concerning recreation and leisure time activities--the long range effects of good leisure--time activities need to be emphasized.

Denver Dec. 9 Comments cont...

23. Will this Public Law provide counseling/leisure services in the form of family rehabilitation, in dealing with child?

24. Working more prescriptively with the children--planning and learning more of the programs geared for specific problems, etc. Special emphasis needed in working with emotionally distrubed--understanding their past and developing a program to overcome this past and create a more positive today and future.

    Thoroughly enjoyed and appreciated John Nesbitt's contribution--very helpful.

25. Most of this information does not apply to the local level agencies. Also the fact that most recreation departments are ready to provide services through outdoor specialists, etc., (not necessarily recreation therapists) is altogether ignored.

26. The program was excellent and well done through out.

27. Continuing information--follow-up meetings and mailings on changes, clarification when we stand, etc.

28. I wish to know how to get certified in Colorado.

    Thanks John! It was informative and inspiring. We got into hospitals; we are moving rapidly into community recreation; I have confidence we are winning this one too!.

29. I am not involved with handicapped now, but I am intered in information on athletic areas.

30. This was quite informative but why wasn't this held earlier so we had an important input in the Colorado State Plan? Recreation is a necessity.

31. Too much covered in too little time!

32. I need information on trail, sign and other outdoor facilities, legal accessibility, recommendations, etc.

33. This questionaire is much too complicated. I heard of this conference by word of mouth only. The first speaker used too much jargon. The second speaker was boring.

34. I would like to see some in-service training offered in the area of emotionally distrubed children (including the abused and neglected) and mentally ill adults.

3 Recreation activities that you currently offer in your classes.

1. snow and water skiing
2. bike riding
3. rafting
4. competitive sports }
5. music and drama } for physically disabled
6. outdoor ed. activities}
7. exercise
8. sports (volleyball, swimming, tennis, bowling)
9. creative arts (play reading, music, dance)
10. square dancing
11. ceramics
12. bowling
13. canoeing
14. bicycling - movement activities
15. backpacking - x-country skiing
16. rollerskating
17. swimming
18. dancing
19. physical education
20. social development (interpersonal and personal skills)
21. 4 day/wk. after-school recreation and some weekends (approx. 12/school year)
22. instructional swim
23. drama
24. arts and crafts class
25. sports - swimming, bowling, ind. and team sports
26. arts and crafts
27. outdoor recreation - skiing, hiking, camp skills
28. arts and crafts
29. poetry
30. adapted sports
31. sports and games)
32. outdoor recreation (everything is RT
33. socialization - party planning, etc.)
34. music
35. table games
36. crafts
37. arts and crafts
38. games
39. pre-op teaching
40. free play with tactile media (clay, sand, water, etc.)
41. library use
42. table hockey
43. swim
44. gross motor or p.e.
45. afterschool rec. program
46. swimming
47. playgrounds
48. basketball
49. wheelchair basketball
50. wheelchair archery
51. swimming
52. leather crafts
53. audio-visual opportunities
54. string art
55. entertainment
56. recreation
57. sports (indoor

58. dance
59. music and poetry
60. art
61. creative dramatics
62. basic pottery/art and crafts
63. adopted sports - volleyball, relays, obstacle course
64. macrame
65. plant therapy
66. crafts (scrap and other)
67. swimming (arts and crafts
68. bowling
69. roller skating
70. music
71. art
72. individual sports
73. aquatics
74. crafts
75. leisure counseling
76. recreation department - offer many
77. swimming
78. cooking
79. bowling
80. music
81. drama
82. dance
83. skiing
84. bowling
85. swimming
86. frisbee throwing (M.R.)
87. self-defense (blind/visually handicapped)
88. crafts CMR
89. learning for living
90. cooking class
91. special olympic - gymnastics and run, dribble and shout workshops
92. arts and crafts - ceramics, etc.
93. drama, and music - plays
94. sports and games - wheelchair basketball
95. swimming
96. leisure awareness counseling
97. therapeutic recreation education - Pt. behaviors and meeting individual + 4goals -RT.
98. wheelchair sports (track and field,swimming, basketball)
99. adaptive arts and crafts (pottery for example)
100. music instruction (piano, accordian)
101. trampoline
102. table games
103. social events
104. swimming
105. music
106. ceramics
107. crafts -pottery
108. sports - gym war, volleyball
109. crative dramatics
110. arts and crafts
111. developing coordination and visual discrim.
112. drama
113. dance
114. crafts
115. community Rec

116. square dancing
117. rhythm land
118. swimming
119. leisure counseling and leisure assessment
120. vocational and career counseling
121. individual instruction in lifetime pursuits
122. arts
123. gross motor - perceptual, swimming, testing
124. instructional freetime
125. cultural - dance, arts, music, theater, etc.
126. outdoor- camping, skiing, rock climbing, etc.
127. athletics - sports - men/women/youth, tournaments, lessons
128. arts and crafts
129. sports and games
130. outdoor recreation
131. drama
132. creative movement
133. pottery
134. nature walks
135. inclass nature activities
136. other nature activities
137. swimming
138. joggin
139. basketball
140. square dance
141. rollerskating

3 Recreation Activities you would Like to offer.

1. horseback riding
2. rafting
3. literary
4. macrame
5. physical fitness program
6. cultural related games, arts and/or act's
7. rock climbing
8. outdoor education activities
9. bowling
10. arts and crafts
11. skiing and other winter sports and activities
12. at this time we offer what the students, parents, and Rec. persons have developed and offer no obvious strains
13. specific fitness classes
14. horseback riding
15. trips-excursion
16. environmental education for handicapped
17. nature discovery activities - school aged and adults
18. outdoor recreation training
19. league activities
20. family special events
21. outdoor recreation excursions and environmental experiences
22. outdoor
23. more outdoor recreation
24. activities that do not require major expense or facility
25. community programming
26. sports offered in public schools intramurals
27. lifetime physical activities
28. leisure counseling
29. parent education/recreation
30. leisure counseling
31. art and music therapy
32. skating
33. music on a more regular and organized basis
34. P. E, for retarded adults in work activities center
35. outdoor educational experience
36. horseback riding
37. cultural activities (theatre, dance, music)
38. preschool
39. handball-raquetball
40. sailing
41. boxing (wheelchairs)
42. hunting
43. fishing
44. backpacking
45. music
46. drama
47. physical fitness
48. more dance
49. outdoor activities; horseback riding, sailing, etc.
50. inter-school handicapped recreation classes
51. family plus handicapped children, special events, special activities
52. outdoor education activities
53. pre-school programming for outpatients
54. dental prevention program utilizing recreation media
55. ice skating (starting end of Dec.)
56. cross country skiing
57. down hill skiing (starting Jan)

58. canoeing
59. family camping
60. campcraft
61. more individualized leisure skills assessment
62. skiing
63. drama
64. outdoor recreation - canoeing and sailing
65. camping
66. outdoor crafts, nature skills
67. ice skating
68. gross motor circuit
69. jogging - fitness etc.
70. fencing
71. stainglass
72. swimming
73. full day program
74. outdoor recreation outings
75. fishing
76. back-packing
77. locomotor skills
78. dance- folk, modern, boogie
79. relaxation skills
80. a larger T.R. Department to enhance
81. leisure assessment and recommendation on each
82. patient, not just a few
83. horseback riding program for paraplegics
84. reading group/poetry forum
85. nutrition/cooking program
86. drama
87. music
88. hobbies/clubs
89. adapted P.E.
90. dance therapy
91. drama
92. swimming
93. music
94. outdoor activities - adults
95. outdoor activities - children
96. outdoor education
97. drama
98. demonstration of therapy for non-handicapped children
99. more dance
100. art and music
101. outdoor long term activities
102. drama
103. walking-jogging
104. camping
105. research and resource facility coordinated
106. w/community and area facilities
107. dance (therapy) (
108. music (therapy)) using these recreation media more diagnostically
109. art (therapy) (
110. acquainting our transit residents to our facilities
111. leisure counseling to the public
112. family fitness
113. music therapy
114. choral groups
115. musical presentations
116. outdoor camping, wilderness experiences

117. no recreation per se
118. gymnastics
119. dance - creative and folk
120. music
121. mountaineering
122. skiing
123. drama

Skills from in-service training needed.

1. grant writing
2. ADP (Processing of variables and sub variables for time studies)
3. patient evaluation
4. rec. program evaluation
5. motor assessment
6. initial evaluation techniques
7. leisure counseling
8. outdoor education - areas in curriculum
9. development of a more dynamic funding
10. support system , more sources, need more information
11. for funding sources (finding them knowing what are requirements, etc.)
12. adaptations of programs
13. communication skills
14. sources of funding
15. communication techniques
16. involvement techniques
17. agency and school intra-action in providing services
18. community education to all services available to special population
19. leisure counseling
20. transportation problems
21. insurance
22. cultural/ethic
23. leisure counseling - program development
24. measurement and evaluation of gross and finer motor skills
25. measuring progress in social leisure behavior
26. group activities designed for emotionally disturbed adolescents
27. model format for PE/Rec IEP assessment, goals and objectives
28. leisure counseling
29. music therapy
30. art therapy
31. simple dance to teach T.M.R.
32. adaptive P.E. techniques
33. how to write for grants and funds
34. sewing skills -crafts
35. social game skills
36. low skilled team games
37. orienting
38. group leisure counsel for adults
39. evaluation of program effectiveness
40. communication skills between related disciplines
41. assessment of motor skills
42. leisure counseling
43. transportation problems and how to remedy them
44. grant funding for new TR programs in the community
45. volunteer management in recreational activities
46. organization concepts- academic, social and recreational
47. evaluation form (computer concept) to incorporate academic social and recreational classes with room for updated information.
48. ability to administer assessment instruments
49. leisure counseling
50. grant writing
51. charting techniques
52. in-depth leisure counseling
53. licensing or the like process
54. how to fund programs
55. proper developmental sequences in teaching various sports skills and activity skill to TMR and EMR.

56. behavior mod. related rec. therapy for MR.
57. pre-testing post testing
58. establishing baseline
59. new crafts
60. sports skills
61. we offer alot of beneficial inservices all ready
62. locomotor, dance, relaxation skills
63. improved leisure assessment skills
64. adapted play-rec techniques for adult psychiatry
65. improved individual leisure goals to increase Pt/clt. motivation
66. grant writing resources - who to contact? How?
67. how to implement a workshop or body language + nonverbal communication
68. music therapy techniques and philosophy
69. developing more prescriptive programs
70. more effective planning/organization
71. learning spontaniety in programs - being able to adapt quickly when in charge of program
72. creative dramatics
73. grant writing
74. standardization of forms
75. swimming for handicapped
76. music/rhythm
77. outdoor education
78. sign language
79. extended first aid
80. testing and assessment
81. materials available for use
82. available services to teachers within community
83. funding for Rec. Federal and STate
84. community and school recreators compare programs
85. arts dance music etc.
86. camping w/aged
87. cultural related activities
88. leisure counseling
89. program planning and management
90. volunteer services
91. inter-agency and multi-disc. approach
92. dance, music, art therapy used more diagnostically
93. sports
94. games
95. leisure counseling
96. interaction-personnel- staff
97. management
98. music
99. drama
100. programs for the deaf
101. gymnastics
102. relaxation skills
103. dance - creative and folk

"Model Community Recreation and P.L. 94-142"

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

NAME: Regional Conference Southern District Conference of the AAHPER

NUMBER ATTENDING: 85

PLACE: Little Rock, Arkansas

NUMBER OF REQUESTS: 30

DATE: February 25, 1978

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 56

The Institute/Session and Materials:
0 - No response/omit
1 - Very negative
2 - Negative
M - Mean score
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Postive
5 - Very positive
n - Number evaluating

Institute/Session Presentations	M	n	0	1/%	2/%	3/%	4/%	5/%
...presentation of models	3.9	45	4	1/2	3/7	15/33	16/36	10/22
...guidelines, goals, statements	3.7	47	4	0	1/2	13/28	22/47	11/23
...printed brochures and materials	4.4	52	0	1/2	1/2	5/10	12/23	33/63
...audio-visual materials used	3.7	54	0	0	3/5	20/37	22/41	9/17
...lectures and presentations	4.0	56	0	1/2	1/2	15/27	21/37	18/32
Quality of Interaction								
...opportunity to ask questions, respond to presentations	4.3	51	0	0	3/6	11/21	26/52	11/21
...opportunity to engage in information exchange with other participants	3.4	51	0	1/2	5/10	21/41	20/39	4/ 8
...opportunity to engage in social exchange and to interact	3.6	47	3	0	2/4	21/45	19/40	5/11
Institute/Session Organization								
My understanding of the institute/session objectives	3.9	39	0	0	1/2	12/31	16/41	10/26
...institute/session facilities	4.1	52	0	0	2/4	13/25	17/33	20/38
...institute/session publicity	3.7	49	1	2/4	5/10	14/29	21/43	9/18
...institute/session staff work	4.0	49	3	0	0	13/27	25/51	11/22
...institute/session operation	4.0	49	3	0	0	16/33	21/43	12/24

*Tabulations and percentages for each item are based on the number of individuals rendering an evaluation on each item. Non-responses and omits are not used in any item. The Mean score is a mean score of the evaluations made on each item.

General Comments

Little Rock, Arkansas

1. I hope we continue to have opportunity to attend further sessions in such conventions! I would like new information and reporting on progress of current programs.

2. I would like to see information and/or models that others have developed so that my program may be developed to its potential at the earliest possible date. This exchange of ideas will also eliminate many costly mistakes which others may have already made.

3. Because the booklet was not available, those in attendance could not follow the presentation.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Community recreation for handicapped, or special recreation as it may come to be called nationally, is being provided through a wide range of delivery systems that are using both new models of service as well as more standard or traditional models of service. In addition to the professionally recognized recreation and park delivery system and the health-rehabilitation delivery system, there are new as well as traditional models within other delivery systems in the following categories: consumer models, advocate models, creative and performing arts models, (including museums), educational models, commercial models, civic/community models, voluntary agency models, youth service models, and so on. Future planning for the development nationally of recreation opportunity and participation for people who are handicapped should take in account these additional delivery systems and models and should recognize that their potential for provision of recreation opportunity and participation vastly exceeds the existing traditionally recognized delivery systems.

2. In general, it should be recognized that recreation and parks service and health-rehabilitation service, as the traditional systems of delivery of recreation and leisure opportunity to people who are handicapped are functioning at 10 per cent or less of their potential and they are reaching 10 per cent or less of their potential clientele. National and Federal leadership in policy formation and in program service support is needed in significant proportions if progress is to be made that correlates with need. A tripartite partnership should be created among public agencies, consumers and advocates and the public at large, voluntary effort and development matching public effort and development at each successive stage of development.

3. There are many new models of service for recreation and leisure programs and services for people who are handicapped. Among the foremost are the following:

    - special recreation facilities and services models
    - consumer models
    - advocacy models
    - creative and performing arts models
    - youth service models

4. Federal agencies should consider designating special recreation as a high priority area for support for service, technical assistance, training, research and demonstration.

5. The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped should consider direct pursuit of the findings, insights, procedures and goals determined through the National Institute Project. This can be done by actively seeking means of funding special projects, training, research and demonstration, as well as other types of support activity, in the area of special recreation.

The National Institute

The National Institute on New Models of Community Based Recreation and Leisure Programs and Services for Handicapped Children and Youth, conducted through the Recreation Education Program of the University of Iowa, was funded by the U.S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. The Project Director and Project Officer were, respectively, Dr. John A. Nesbitt, Professor, Recreation Education Program, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; and Mr. William A. Hillman, Jr., Specialist in Physical Education and Recreation, U.S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Washington, D.C.

From 1975 to 1978 the National Institute provided:

* Nationwide research and study on some 100 local community recreation for handicapped programs.

* Nationwide training in community or special recreation for handicapped for 2,500 personnel involved in recreation and park service from 48 states at 30 in-service training sessions.

* Preparation of training guides and materials as follows:

# 1 New Concepts and New Processes in Special Recreation, 156 pp.

# 2 Model Special Recreation Services, 463 pp.

# 3 Papers on New Models of Community or Special Recreation for Handicapped, 354 pp.

# 4 Federal Funding for Special Recreation, 86 pp.

5 Leisure Fulfillment for Handicapped and the White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals, 26 pp.

# 6 Educating the Handicapped Child for Leisure Fulfillment, 133 pp.

# 7 Special Recreation in Rural Areas, 188 pp.

# 8 Newsletters of the National Institute, various pages.

9 Information Sources on Special Recreation, various pages.

# 10 Report of the National Institute on New Models of Community Based Recreation and Leisure Programs and Services for Handicapped Children and Youth, 25 pp. and appendices.

Project Identification

The information reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred. Continuation number GOO: 7-50-1219.